DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 641 HE 010 909

AUTHOR	Scott, Robert A.
TITLE	Lords, Squires, and Yeomen: Collegiate Middle Managers and Their Organizations. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 7.
INSTITUTION	American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	83p.; Some parts may not reproduce clearly
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, DC 20036 ($4.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Personnel; Administrator Background; *Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Education; *Administrator Role; *College Administration; *College Deans; Federal Regulation; Females; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; Interviews; Job Satisfaction; Legal Problems; Literature Reviews; *Middle Management; Minority Groups; Organizational Climate; Organizations (Groups); Professional Associations; Questionnaires; Role Conflict
IDENTIFIERS	Compliance (Legal); Information Analysis Products; Liability

ABSTRACT

This study on collegiate middle managers examines: the effects of federal compliance requirements on collegiate administrators; the cause of growth, elaboration, and differentiation in middle-level collegiate administration; the functions, status, roles, and values of mid-level administrators; and the role of national occupational associations for professional standing. Data were gathered from a literature review, a survey research questionnaire, and structured interviews with more than 200 administrators, faculty, and search committee chairpersons at 18 colleges and universities of different sizes and types. A survey also was conducted of the staff aides and directors of House of Representatives and Senate committees concerned with postsecondary education legislation, the executives of higher education associations in Washington, and the officials at Executive branch agencies. Collegiate mid-level administrators were considered to be the deans and directors of support services. Presidents, provosts, academic deans, department chairpersons, and librarians were excluded. The following topics are considered: sources of administrators and their background and training; career paths, mobility, and organizational commitment; administrators' rights and grievance procedures; women and minorities in middle management; communication on campus; liability of administrators; satisfactions and incentives for increased competence and performance; training and development; role conflicts among collegiate middle managers; and professional associations. Recommendations and a bibliography are included. (SW)

ED 165 411

Lords, Squires, and Yeomen: Collegiate Middle-Managers and Their Organizations

Robert A. Scott

AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education
Research Report No. 7
1978

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared by the
ERIC Clearinghouse
on Higher Education
The George Washington University
Washington, D.C. 20036

Published by
the American Association
for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 780
Washington, D.C. 20036

HE 010 909

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association for Higher Education for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions do not, however, necessarily represent official views or opinions of either the American Association for Higher Education or the National Institute of Education.

Already Published in the 1978 Series

1. Basic Skills Programs: Are They Working?—$4.00
   Mary Kathryn Grant and *Daniel R. Hoeber*

2. To Improve Instruction—$4.00
   Charles C. Cole, Jr.

3. Tenure and Termination in Financial Exigency—$4.00
   Marjorie C. Mix

4. Small Liberal Arts Colleges:
   Diversity at the Crossroads?—$4.00
   Richard W. Jonsen

5. Collective Bargaining in Four-Year Colleges—$4.00
   Barbara A. Lee

6. Compliance with Federal Regulations:
   At What Cost?—$4.00
   Carol Herrnstadt Shulman

To subscribe to the Research Report series (10 issues starting from date of subscription), write to the Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036. The subscription rate for AAHE members is $25, for nonmembers $35. Copies of any of the titles above are available at the price specified. Payment must accompany all orders under $15.

1977 Reports Still Available

1. Federal Regulation and Higher Education — $3.50
   Louis W. Bender

2. Institutional Goals and Student Costs — $3.50
   George B. Weathersby and Frederic Jacobs

3. Higher Education Opportunity: A Decade of Progress — $4.50
   Larry L. Leslie

5. University Admissions in the 1970's — $3.50
   Carol Herrnstadt Shulman

6. Alternative Tuition Systems — $3.50
   Douglas S. MacDonald

7. Graduate Education in the 1970's — $3.50
   David A. Trivett

8. Concepts of Career and General Education — $3.50
   Paul A. Olson

9. Governing Board and Administrator Liability — $3.50
   Robert S. Hendrickson and Ronald S. Mangum

10. Manpower Studies in Postsecondary Education — $3.50
    Donald M. Norris, William F. Lasher, and Floyd C. Brandt

Copies of any of the titles listed above are available at the specified price. To order, write to the Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D. C. 20036. Payment must accompany all orders under $15.

Acknowledgments

The reading and thinking represented in this volume have been encouraged by numerous friends among the ranks of both middle-management and faculty. Jim Bess (Columbia), Deane Bornheimer (N.Y.U.), and Gerry Thomas (Cornell) have been especially helpful. Special thanks also go to the 200 middle-managers I interviewed as part of my Exxon Education Foundation-supported study in 1977 of the effects of federal regulations on the costs, operations, and administrative organizations of colleges and universities, and to the 65 respondents (72%) to my extensive survey research questionnaire.

This volume is dedicated to the late David A. Trivett, who in his friendship encouraged and aided my work.

Foreword

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, in 1976 there were over 1 million full- and part-time professional employees of institutions of higher education. Of these, approximately 102,000 are classified as executive, administrative, or managerial. These are the individuals who are responsible for the noninstructional functions of an institution. The vast majority of them serve in positions that greatly affect the day-to-day operations of an institution, its educational mission, and even its survival.

With the exception of the top-level executives, e.g., presidents and vice-presidents, most of these employees have very low visibility within the academy. Yet they are the ones who control the budgets, assign and train support personnel, select the students who will be attending the institution, and negotiate matters with state and federal offices. They also are the ones who develop and transmit information that creates the public image of the institution. And they are the ones that help to attract gifts that allow the faculty to have increased freedom to pursue their academic interests.

But who exactly are these professionals? What are their educational and experimental backgrounds? To what extent do they identify with the beliefs, norms, and values of the faculty? Is their professional allegiance to the institution? to the faculty? or to a national peer group? Because of the great power that these individuals hold over the functioning and mission of an institution, it is important to know exactly who they are, what they do, and how their performance affects the institution.

Robert A. Scott, associate dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and Adjunct Professor of Anthropology, Cornell University, has just completed a comprehensive study of middle-managers. This study involved extensive interviews of nonacademic professionals, including a review of their duties and responsibilities. From this vantage point Dr. Scott has developed an analysis of the literature that helps to clarify the actual and potential role of middle-managers in the overall functioning of institutions of higher education.

Jonathan D. Fife, Director
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education

Contents

Overview 1

Who Are Collegiate Middle-Managers? 3

The Organizational Setting Of Work on Campus 10
Sources of Administrators, and Their Background and Training 13
Career Paths, Mobility, and Organizational Commitment 14
Administrators' Rights and Grievance Procedures 17

Current Issues: Women and Minorities in Middle Management 20
Communication on Campus 22
Concerns for Liability 24
Concerns for Liability 24

Satisfactions and Incentives for Increased Competence and Performance 26

Training and Development 35

Uncertain Loyalists: Role Conflicts Among Collegiate Middle Managers 40
Summary 48

Associations: The Off-Campus Organizations 49

Summary, Recommendations, and Implications 57
What Should Presidents Do and Why? 57
What Can Middle-Managers Do for Themselves? 59
Implications 62

Bibliography 63

Overview

This report examines (a) the effects of federal compliance requirements on collegiate administration; (b) the cause of growth, elaboration, and differentiation in middle-level collegiate administration; (c) the functions, status, roles, and values of mid-level administrators; (d) the role of national occupational associations for professional standing.

It is based on data gathered in an extensive search and analysis of the literature and on a survey research questionnaire and structured interviews with more than two hundred administrators, faculty, and search committee chairpersons at eighteen colleges and universities of different sizes and types. It included a survey of the staff aides and directors of House and Senate committees concerned with postsecondary education legislation, the executives of higher education associations in Washington, and the officials at Executive branch agencies.*

The literature on this topic is uneven in quality and scattered throughout several fields. There are reminiscences by college presidents, studies of the deanship, observations and descriptions by administrators and faculty in higher education, policy studies, theoretical works in psychology and sociology, compensation studies and training manuals, and studies in educational administration (mostly at the elementary and secondary level), but only a few good studies have contributed to a basic understanding of the roles and functions of middle-administration (for example, Angus (1973), Bess and Lodahl (1969), Brooks (1973), Hauser and Lazarfeld (1964), Ingraham and King (1968), Perkins (1973), and Shattock (1970)). Strands from these various works are pulled together in an attempt to weave a fabric that displays both a portrait of collegiate middle-managers and the landscape in which they work.

The metaphor "lords, squires, and yeoman" represents a conceptual model for understanding the roles and prospects of collegiate middle-managers: they are in the center of a status hierarchy with limited mobility. The effects of organizational size and complexity on middle-management functions, the way these functions are organized, and their specialized nature has much to do with the value dilemma con-

*This research was supported by the Exxon Educational Foundation in 1977.

fronting middle managers of service for others versus control of others and their activities.

An analysis of the literature on performance evaluation and statisfactions and incentives for increased competence and performance reveals that in matters such as job security, opportunities for professional development (including short-term assignments and study leaves), recognition, and true-merit salary plans, middle-managers come up short. There are crucial differences in the training of managers in higher education, industry, and government: in the profit sector, staff development is encouraged as a means of identifying future top managers; in higher education training is viewed as a matter of individual, not organizational development. This leads to conflicting role relationships and uncertain status for collegiate middle-managers, especially in terms of official interactions, informal interactions, and salary levels as gross indicators of role and status relationships.

Because mobility and opportunities for growth are limited by structural and philosophical impediments, middle-managers are urged to take the initiative in their relations with other administrators and with faculty. Some recommendations for presidents and their institutions to consider as a way to deal with mid-level management dilemmas include: the development of incentives that reenforce major job satisfaction; the creation of feed-back mechanisms about successes and shortcomings; encouragement of their participation in institutional goal setting activities; the encouragement of internal mobility; and the creation of an institutional climate where middle-management innovation is fostered.

Because federal, state, and corporate trustee requirements for administrative accountability in academic, financial, and personnel matters carry such severe sanctions, presidents should learn how campus authorities conduct their business. Furthermore, only by understanding the roles, functions, needs of mid-level administrators, and by making the best uses of them as extensions of the presidency, will colleges and universities be able to exercise some control over the rise of administrative costs. This should be incentive enough for most institutions to take a closer look at the potential represented by middle-management that is going untapped and often unrewarded.

Who Are Collegiate Middle-Managers?

For several reasons, "lords, squires, and yeomen" seem suitable "ideal types" on which to base an analogy to collegiate middle-managers: first, because they remind one of England, the source of many of our ideas about collegiate structure; second, because they suggest a social system in which service to a "higher purpose" is an accepted aim; and third, because they represent a hierarchical ranking of status levels in which there is mobility, but on either end of which there are other levels of rank—royalty on the one and peasant on the other.

Lords or nobles are political appointees of cabinet rank. Squires are the class under nobility, known as "landed gentry," and hold important administrative offices. The British yeomen are freeholding farmers, journey-men, and higher-class attendants in the service of a nobleman or royalty. As yeomen of the chamber or of the stables they are not simply assistants but are responsible for specific activities. They comprise "a stock from which about half the gentry [squires] originally sprang" (Perrott 1968, p. 176).

For our purposes, lords, squires, and yeomen are mid-level collegiate administrators, the deans and directors of support services to whom their assistants and first-line, most often nonexempt, supervisors report, and who themselves report to or are an officer at the vice-presidential level. I do not include presidents or provosts (the monarchs, or royalty) because they typically come from the faculty, have not been career administrators, have status that sets them apart from other administrators, and are the senior officers. I exclude academic deans, department chairmen, and librarians for similar reasons. These officials are certainly administrators, but their status and roles set them outside the commonly accepted administrative ranks. They are viewed as "amateurs" by the lords, squires and yeomen (Knapp 1969; Baldridge et al., 1978, p. 9) and with good reason: advertisements for these positions often say "successful administrative experience is not a prerequisite for the position." In a *Chronicle of Higher Education* article, Professor Charles Cherry of Villanova wrote, "conventional wisdom has it that the qualified academic administrator is the professor who answers his mail" (1978).

At the other end of the hierarchy, nonexempt supervisors (i.e., those not exempt from Fair Labor Standards Act overtime pay re-

Table 1. Middle Managers (Lords, Squires, and Yeomen)

Academic Affairs	Administrative Affairs	Student Affairs	External Affairs
Director, Institutional Research	Chief Planning Officer	Registrar	Director, Community Services
	Director, Computer Center	Director of Admissions	Chief Development Officer
	Director, Information Service	Director, Student Housing	Chief Public Relations Officer
	Chief Business Officer	Chief Student Life Officer	Director, Information Office
	Chief Budgeting Officer	Director, Student Union	
	Director, Personnel Services	Director, Student Placement	
	Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Officer	Director, Student Financial Aid	
		Director, Student Counseling	
	Director, Physical Plant	Director, Athletics	
	Purchasing Agent		
	Director, Food Services		
	Comptroller		
	Manager, Bookstore		
	Staff Legal Counsel		
	Chief Health Affairs Officer		

Table 2. Administration and Instruction as a Percent of Current Fund Expenditures 1929-74.

	1929-30	1939-40	1949-50	1959-60	1969-70	1973-74
Administration and general expenses	8.4%	9 %	9.5%	10.4%	12.5%	13.7%
Instruction and department research	44 %	41.5%	34.7%	32 %	32.7%	33.3%

quirements) are excluded because they do not have the executive authority that would make them true managers. And they are persons of lower social rank with little education and modest financial means who engage in tasks requiring lower-level skills and responsibilities.

Middle-managers are between these points of reference. They have a variety of titles (director, chief, secretary) or are known by the name of their office (registrar) and serve a variety of functions. They usually have no command authority, report to their respective bosses, even though they are "knowledge professionals" who do "operating work"—and their decisions and actions are intended to have direct and major impact on the institution they serve (Drucker 1973, p. 449). "They contribute the essential information without which the key decisions cannot be made, and implement them effectively" (p. 450). The 52 administrative positions surveyed annually by CUPA include 28 which are considered in the middle-management category. These are shown in Table 1.

Middle management staffs fulfill three functions: they serve as liaison with external suppliers of resources, whether financial, human, or materiel; they implement procedures for internal allocation of resources and control of activities, especially in matters of campus coordination and compliance with external requirements; and they work with student activities and curricular responsibilities in helping students become oriented to college requirements, standards, and opportunities.

Such staffs have been found in colleges and universities for years. In England, the precursors of today's academic registrars and bursars were appointed during the Middle Ages (Angus 1973). In the U.S., before the Civil War, most colleges employed a president, a treasurer, and a part-time librarian, in addition to the faculty, to exercise resibility in needed areas. After the War, college administration began to grow and splinter because of enrollment increases and demands for new services. First a secretary of faculty was appointed, then a registrar and

> then in succession a vice president, a dean, a dean of women, a chief business officer, an assistant dean, a dean of men, a director of admissions, and in time a corps of administrative assistants to the president who were in charge of anything and everything—[alumni and] public relations, church relations, civic relations, student relations, faculty relations (Rudolph 1962, pp. 434-435).

In time, of course, these "assistants-to" positions became autonomous offices.

In modern times the growth of collegiate administration has been frequently discussed (Bowen and Minter 1977; Baldridge et al., 1978; Knapp 1969; Richman and Farmer 1974; Scott 1977b). Between 1929 and the mid-1960's, expenditures for administration increased 21 times (Harris 1972, p. 811). And in the short span of time from the mid-1960's to the early 1970's, current fund expenditures for administration by colleges and universities increased by more than 30 percent, while expenditures for instruction increased by only 10 percent (Mertin 1974); and this was during a period when enrollments nearly doubled (Thompson 1970, p. 5). However, numbers of individuals are not the whole story.

In 1929-30, general administration and general expenses represented 8.4 percent of current fund expenditures, while instruction and department research represented 44 percent. Over 45 years those figures changed substantially *(Digest of Educational Statistics* 1973, p. 111; 1976, p. 112). See Table 2.

As a percentage of current fund expenditures, expenses for general administration have grown during this period by more than 50 percent; by comparison, instructional expenses dropped by 25 percent during a time when enrollments increased by nearly 1,000 percent *(Digest of Educational Statistics* 1974).

The number and type of administrative positions have increased in response to internal forces of growth and to external demand. In recent years, these forces have caused the introduction, development, and greater use of positions such as affirmative action officers, veterans' counselors, ombudsmen, minority student program specialists, women's counselors, pension managers, institutional research officers, salary classification specialists, government relations and sponsored program officers, and labor relations experts, to name but a few examples.

Obviously, rising costs make college administration an area we need to know more about, but there are other reasons. One is the manner in which mid-level administrators perform their tasks in support of an institution's goals and in control of its activities. Another is that middle-management represents a job category where increasing numbers of minorities and women will look for employment. It is now largely male in composition and limited in its opportunities for advancement (Van Alstyne et al., 1977b). Certain questions will have to be addressed: How are people recruited to these positions? And what are their prospects and goals? Still another reason for looking

at college administrators is the training programs for middle-managers. So little is known about this quasi-professional group that many such programs seem inadequate (Bess and Lodahl 1969; Fisher 1977c). Neither the group nor its needs are well understood, and its members often feel insecure and threatened. Until we know and understand the nature and role of middle-managers, and the effects of federal and state compliance requirements on their positions, we cannot adequately control growth, offer effective training and compensation programs, or mount successful affirmative-action programs for administrative positions.

The specific functions of these administrators have been described and analyzed by numerous writers and scholars (Burns, Blackwell, Knowles, McVey and Hughes, Nielsen, Packwood, Persson, Scott 1977b, among others). The functions performed, the organization of functions, and the specialization of functions vary by the size and complexity of the institution. For example, every collegiate institution must accomplish the tasks of admission and the registration and scheduling of classes, but not every one will have both an admissions officer and a registrar. Some colleges do not have institutional research officers; others do not have computer center operators. Personnel officers will serve as an example of the functional differentiation possible in institutions of varying size.

In some institutions there is no single personnel officer. The functions of employment and maintenance of records are greatly decentralized, and many of the tasks are the responsibility of the chief administrative officer's secretary. At the next higher level, there is a personnel officer and his staff who are responsible for employment activities, benefits management, and records maintenance. A still higher level includes, in addition to the functions mentioned previously, wage, salary, and unemployment insurance administration, employee orientation and relations, and personnel policy development.

In the next higher level the personnel department offers the programs mentioned earlier plus others, such as personnel development and training, labor relations, and occasionally even performance evaluation. The highest level is one in which organizational development and planning, organizational systems analysis and development, staff development and manpower planning, and perhaps personnel counseling, are pre-eminent concerns. This is the stage of the "comprehensive personnel program" or the "total personnel program" (Scott 1977a).

Size also has an effect on admissions-office activities (Scott 1976b). In contrast to Hauser and Lazarsfeld's 1964 study, Vinson (1977) found that admissions directors now spend more time supervising others than in "grass roots" admissions activities. He also found a significant decline in the admissions officers' participation in non-admissions administrative activities, especially in the area of freshman financial aid and course registration. The inferences to be drawn from these findings are clear. At least in admissions, and perhaps in other categories of administration as well, there has been both growth in the numbers of officials and a trend toward specialization of tasks. A result is what is called a rise in "professionalization" of the positions; however, one other finding by Vinson pricks the bubble of professional status: admissions officers now report to a lower-level institutional officer. This suggests that growth and differentiation of administrative positions may lead to a reduction in status for "older" positions (see also Whitmire 1978).

Financial aid officers are an appropriate example for discussion of another element of administrative function, the matter of service versus control. Aid officers think of themselves as student counselors, with students and parents as their clients; but when questioned in detail about the tasks they perform, they said fiscal matters command more time than students' problems. Financial aid officers want to work with students to help them enroll and continue in college, yet more and more of their time must be given to reports and control activities (Scott 1978c).

Other administrators do not face the service-versus-control dilemma so squarely; still, it exists nonetheless. Administration is presumed to support the major activities of the institution, but increasingly it has itself become one of the major activities. The emphasis has shifted from service to the enforcement or control of budget, accounting, and personnel procedures (Scott 1978a; Gifford 1978).

The forces that influence the trend toward control have been studied, and it has been noted that institutional behavior in its response to external forces is as much to blame for the result as is the force itself (Scott 1978a). However, the tradition of "service" in our society has not been examined for its campus implications. While we claim that administration is supposed to serve, perhaps this is a romantic notion not tied to reality. Or, perhaps it is a value lost to history. Or, perhaps service-oriented administration obtained when faculty colleagues were asked to assume those early administrative positions and professors identified themselves more with an in-

stitution than with a discipline. It could be that the advent of career administrators and the development of discipline-oriented faculty were both symptoms of outside pressures on institutions and partial causes for the demise of a purer service function. Other views of this dilemma are expressed in Eble (1978, pp. 4, 113, 115, 125).

Nevertheless, it seems to be true that our society lacks a strong tradition of service, such as in the English civil service—"in her Majesty's service"—and in British college administration (Halsey and Trow, 1971, p. 114), so our administrators do not look at this form as a role model. We place a higher value on mobility and advancement than on service (Moodie and Eustace 1974, pp. 154-169; Tocqueville 1969, p. 551).

Collegiate middle-managers reflect this tension in their answers to several questions on the author's Exxon Education Foundation survey. Collegiate middle-managers are oriented to serve faculty and students, committed to a career in the institution, and satisfied that they are competent and achieve desired results in challenging work. But they are extremely frustrated by not being taken seriously, by the lack of recognition of their accomplishments, by low pay, by the lack of authority that accompanies their responsibility, and by the lack of direction given to them (Scott 1978b; Thomas 1978). The training and promotion of experts is stressed but the reward system is not adequate to the skills required.

The Organizational Setting of Work on Campus

Colleges and universities are among the most complex of organizations. They are in some ways collegial in nature, in other ways political, and in still other ways bureaucratic (Baldridge et al., 1978). This mixture is clearer in large institutions but it exists in small ones too: the academic dean is the major link between the stratified collegial structure of his college—which is really synonymous with his faculty and their departments; only the dean's staff provides a hint of bureaucracy—and the primarily bureaucratic nature of the central administration. However, while the dean is the primary formal link with the senior central academic officer, normally a provost, the dean's staff responsible for academic support services, student services, and financial matters works closely with central officials in the same areas. In other words, the mid-level administrators in both colleges and central staffs are linked in common duties. Allegiances may differ, one to the college and one to the university or central administration, but the substance of the work is largely the same.

This role as links or "linking pins," borrowing from Henderson and Henderson (1974, p. 217), Likert (1961, pp. 113-115), and Katz and Kahn (1966, p. 321), is a variation of an industrial role model. There, middle managers act as links between two levels of organizational structure and "serve as funnels through which the intentions of top management flow down and information flows up" (Kay 1973, p. 5).

Collegiate middle-managers serve as linking pins between vertical levels but, given the "mixed organizational structure" of colleges and universities,* they also serve as linking pins between horizontal structures, i.e., between colleges and central offices. As in industry, collegiate middle-managers implement but rarely develop policy; they do not contribute directly to the institution's mission. Instead they are adjuncts who exist because top management cannot cope with the volume and complexity of the workload.

Both the collegiate and the bureaucratic elements of the organizations are influenced by a politically mandated governance system

*The term "mixed organization" is used because of its similarity in both form and content to the term "mixed economy," which refers to an economic system including elements of both public and private enterprise. A mixed organizational structure includes bureaucratic, collegial, and political elements.

comprised of faculty, students, and staff. For interesting and thoughtful analyses of this unique, mixed organizational structure, see Baldridge et al. (1978, p. 9), Caplow and McGee (1958), Ikenberry (1972), Cohen and March (1974), Ryan (1977), McHenry (1977), Perkins (1973), and Blankenship (1977). The Perkins' volume compares the university as an organization to other forms of organization, such as companies, banks, and government bureaus. Blankenship is editor of a volume that offers studies of several types of "mixed" organizations, including hospitals, law firms, social service agencies, and police departments. Each of these organizations is a mixture of professionals as equals working with nonprofessionals in a partial or pseudo-bureaucratic setting.

The basic assumptions of collegial, bureaucratic, and political systems are well-known. Some author's metaphors about "market influences" (Caplow and McGee 1958) and "organized anarchy" (Cohen and March 1974) have captured the imaginations of succeeding generations of analysts. Millett's more modest "organized autonomy" (Millett 1977), is a suitable metaphor for this study's focus.

The essential differences between collegial, bureaucratic and political systems include objectives, sources and lines of authority, and differentiation among structural components (Blau 1974, p. 297n; Van de Graaf 1978). Since our concern is with the organizational setting for the work of mid-level collegiate administrators, and since much attention has been given elsewhere to the organization of "academic" work (Blau 1973; Perkins 1973; Baldridge et al. 1978; Parsons and Platt 1973), I want to turn now to two other issues of major importance: (1) the effect of collegiate organization on mid-level administrators' responsibilities and activities, and (2) the effect of collegiate organization on the careers of middle-managers.

Throughout this monograph, the roles and tasks of middle-managers will be discussed. The effect of organizational size on the differentiation of functions has already been noted (Meyer 1972; Brown 1969; Altbach 1977). In this section particular attention will be given to additional selected effects of the mixed organizational structure.

The structure is complex. It is not merely a merging of the bureaucratic and the collegial with a dash of the political, but a state of uneasy balance made up of entirely different and, to some degree, noncomplementary forms. The balance includes not only formal and informal authorities and professional and nonprofessional staffs, but both unitary and federal structures, single and multi-

ple value systems, consensual and bureaucratic coordination, and hierarchical and "flat-structure" communications. It is a rough balance between the conditions required for academic freedom and individual autonomy, and the necessity for organizational efficiency, accountability, and control (Ikenberry 1972). Decentralized versus centralized authority are constant value themes. Most institutions are "fiercely decentralized," resulting in the "organized autonomy" of which Millett (1977) speaks.

The values of collegiate middle-managers are not purely bureaucratic, as one might guess from their administrative organizational structure, but are informed by the collegial sentiments and beliefs of the faculty (Bess 1978). This effect varies with the kind and frequency of interaction between managers and faculty; the kind and frequency of interaction varies—as do incentives, conditions, and aspirations—according to position as line or staff.

Another effect of the mixed organizational structure is that socialization is complicated because role models are often ambiguous. There are several reasons for this. In many cases, a middle-manager's superior has not worked in the area he supervises. This is especially true in financial aid and admissions, but also in the other fields (Scott 1978c). Also, the senior officer of the institution is even less likely to have any working knowledge of middle-management fields, their problems, and their complexities. He is, after all, an "amateur" administrator who got where he is by not aiming for it (Cleveland 1977, p. 33; Knapp 1969). Furthermore, the other major clients of the middle-managers—students and faculty—want service and are unlikely to be informed about the field. As a result, of the mixed organizational structure, middle-managers are both circumscribed in what they do and bombarded by a mixture of role cues (see chapter entitled "Uncertain Loyalists") (Scott, 1978d).

Proper socialization to a field or position should result in professional identity, commitment to one's work, and a career (Bucher and Stelling 1977). But this requires role models, even as negative forces, and collegiate middle-managers often do not have them. More than likely colleagues at other campuses and even government officials will be the source of role standards (Graves 1977).

Still another effect, which as far as I know has not been studied, is the influence of academic department organization and values on administrative office organization and values. The result is a lessening of the influence of hierarchical structure and an encouragement of informal relations between status levels. I am not suggesting that

this is universal, but that it is more common in collegiate institutions than in other forms of bureaucracy. However, the committee structure of academic departments and faculties has not been widely adopted in the form of task force organization (Bennis and Slater 1968). One reason for this may be the faculty's reluctance to tolerate administrators without apparent portfolios.

In partial summary, the effects of the mixed organizational structure on the work setting of collegiate mid-level administrators contributes to the confusion of roles, the diffusion of values, and the complexity of tasks.

Sources of Administrators, and Their Backgrounds and Training

Based on the findings of several studies (Ingraham and King 1968; Bess and Lodahl 1969; Thomas 1978; Scott 1976a; AACRAO 1977; CUPA (see Van Alstyne 1977a), and others) one can offer some generalizations about the sources, backgrounds, and training of collegiate middle-managers.

The CUPA survey (Van Alstyne 1977a, pp. 52-54) includes both basic demographic data and summary descriptions of the positions. Of the incumbents surveyed, 79 percent were white men, 5 percent minority group men, 14 percent white women, and 2 percent minority group women. White males predominate in virtually every administrative post except the affirmative action/equal opportunity officer. At white, coeducational institutions, they hold 83 percent of administrative posts (Van Alstyne 1977a, p. 2).

Ten years ago, most mid-level administrators who were directors of offices came to their collegiate positions after they were age 30, well after their college education and graduate training were completed (Bess and Lodahl 1969, p. 221). Ingraham (1968), Hauser and Lazarsfeld (1964), and Scott (1976a) point out that "directors," the officer-level surveyed, were mostly in their forties. About one-half of the office directors surveyed in the 1968 and 1969 studies, as well as in the 1976 and 1978 studies, came to the positions from other collegiate administrative posts or from faculty positions. The others came from secondary school teaching or administration and from outside education. Of course, some of these entered their jobs directly from graduate school. In my 1977 survey (Scott 1978e), the previous positions held included newspaper reporter and editor, army officer, AAUP staff, auditor in a commercial credit company, public accountant, laboratory administrator, and coordinator of

elementary school programs. A strikingly large number of middle-managers start and continue their mid-level administrative careers at the institutions they attended as students (Hauser and Lazarsfeld 1964; Bess and Lodahl 1969; Scott 1976a).

A capsule generalization about middle-managers' backgrounds and training is that their parents are more than likely to be or have been white-collar workers with average or higher educational attainment (Hauser and Lazarsfeld 1964; Scott 1976a). While the percentage obviously varies by position, middle-managers are comparatively well-educated; those with some type of advanced degree out-number those with only bachelor's degrees (Scott 1976a). However, most training for occupational responsibilities is gained on the job. There is neither formal training nor socialization for collegiate middle-managers as there is for school superintendents and principals. In answer to the question about what collegiate middle-managers are like, we can say tentatively that in background, training, and orientation they are probably more like teachers and salesmen than like physicians and librarians; more like businessmen than faculty (Hauser and Lazarsfeld 1964; Scott 1976a).

Career Paths, Mobility, and Organizational Commitment

It is not uncommon when interviewing collegiate middle-managers to find a director of an office who has served for twenty years or more in the same position, during which time his office's responsibilities have grown and expanded. In similar fashion, the whole administrative organization of the college became more complex and added administrative layers. A variation of the "Peter Principle" takes place: the person appointed head of a small service office stays as its head even while it grows in size and complexity; the required skills change, but the same person remains director. In one institution I studied, the director of an office was due to retire after 47 years at its head; the assistant had been second in charge for 19 years. There are several issues highlighted by such an example, not the least of which is loyalty or organizational commitment, with career paths and mobility being others.

The longevity of office directors can serve to retard even further the already limited internal mobility of junior officers in the relatively flat organizational structures of colleges (Scott 1975). Thomas (1978) and Bess and Lodahl (1969) refer to the slight turnover of middle managers, but they sampled only heads of offices. In my study, I asked department heads about turnover among subordinates and as-

sociation officials about turnover among members. Based on this sample it appears that assistants and associates change positions much more frequently than directors.

The literature on the organizational commitment of collegiate administrators is sparse. Thomas (1978) provides an excellent summary and analysis of what is known and contributes to the field with the findings from his research. He cites Lodahl and Kejner (1965) and Buchanan (1974, p. 340), who define job involvement as the degree to which a person's work performance affects self-esteem, identification with the organizational mission, a sense of involvement in one's organizational duties, and a commitment to remain with one's organization.

The message is clear: commitment requires, among other elements, that one's self-esteem be enhanced. Generally, the status and role of collegiate middle-managers is subservient to others, especially faculty (see also Scott, 1978a and 1978c). Consequently, more needs to be known about the loyalty and commitment of college administrators, since their relationship to senior administration and to the governance system, and their opportunities for socialization, are simply not the same as those of the business executives, engineers, and scientists whose organizational commitment has been studied.

Another element of commitment is opportunity. What opportunities for mobility are available to middle-managers? It is true that opportunities for mobility differ by field; not all collegiate middle-managers have similar opportunities for advancement. First, not all categories have clearly defined career paths. Second, not all positions require skills that are desired by industry and government, and persons in these positions have greater opportunities for mobility. So mobility exists in several forms and will be discussed in terms of internal and external mobility.

Internal mobility, or advancement within an institution, is limited in several ways, some of which are obvious, e.g., pyramid-shaped organizations have fewer spots at the top than at the bottom. Mobility may involve traditional advancement, say from assistant director to associate director to director, or from director to vice president. Mobility in this form involves increasing responsibilities over larger numbers of people and for larger budgets, and for supervising more layers of supervisors. This traditional form of serial or upward advancement is greatly limited in colleges and universities because there are fewer levels of supervision than in other organizations (Millett 1977). This short vertical or flat structure, with little distance between the

lowest managers and vice presidents, is accompanied by increasing specialization at the base of the organization. The result is "girth growth" or a short pyramid with a wide bottom.

The impact of Affirmative Action on career paths also makes it difficult for an institution to transfer a junior officer in one department to a mid-level position in another as part of a program in staff development, since the position would have to be widely advertised instead.

Because the traditional form of upward mobility is limited, two variations have developed that may be found in management organizations as well as in colleges. In the one case, the administrative, personnel, or career-counselling office grows in complexity and in the range of services offered and the number of clients serviced. As a result, the director may serve twenty years or more with the same title but with an ever-expanding number of staff members reporting to him. In this case, the middle-manager is "pushed" up a ladder of responsibility, for which there are compensating salary and status adjustments, even though he does not actually move up the organizational ladder.

In the other case, the middle-manager performs a function that is so vital to the health of the institution, says admissions, and becomes so expert at what he does, that he receives acclaim both on and off campus. In recognition of this exceptional service, the university may reward the officer with a change of title to one that reflects higher status. In the case of one nationally known Registrar and Admissions Officer, titles have ranged from Registrar and Director, to Registrar and Dean, to Vice Provost for Registration and Enrollment, to Executive Officer for Enrollment Studies. Other nationally known persons in admissions hold the titles of Assistant Vice President for Life Planning, and Vice President for Enrollment Planning. A cynic might say that such status inflation is silly, but how else other than in salary (an unlikely possibility) can a college or university reward an excellent middle-manager who has devoted many years of successful and sophisticated service to an important job.

Of course not everyone stays. With incumbents in office for so many years and so few opportunities available for lateral transfer to new jobs, junior-level administrators find they must leave to advance. This kind of advancement takes several forms. Some move from an assistant or associate position at one institution to an associate or director position at another. There are those who move and keep the same title but earn a higher salary and command more respect by working in a larger office. And then there are those who achieve up-

ward mobility by downgrade progression. These people trade the status of their current employer for the prestige of a higher position in a college of lower status.* From some middle-management positions, this is the most common type of mobility; however, it too is limited: a senior middle-manager may be already earning a salary that is higher than another institution pays its senior officers.

By definition, there are fewer opportunities for advancement at high status schools because there are fewer of them and not all junior-level administrators at high-status colleges will be able to progress through the ranks at those colleges. As a consequence, these administrators must look for higher level employment at schools of lower status where in fact they are often seen as desirable candidates because of their previous connections. The same phenomena have been reported in England (Brooks 1973).

Another view of mobility is called "turnover." Mobility is valued by middle-managers, but as managers they are concerned about turnover. Is there a proper rate for it? The high rate for financial aid officers—reported as more than 30 percent annually (Scott 1978c)—does not seem healthy, but neither does the slow rate represented by persons who are assistant directors with the same responsibilities for fifteen years or more. Turnover and mobility are topics deserving further research and discussion.

Administrators' Rights and Grievance Procedures

The effects of mixed organizational structure on middle-management careers have resulted in concern for administrators' rights and grievance procedures. There seems to be a trend for middle-level administrators to see themselves as separate in condition and status from the senior administrative levels. This is in part the result of the increased professionalism felt and sought by middle managers.

While the statements of rights and grievance procedures for administrators are meant to be applied to all levels of officials (McInnes 1971), it is clear that the separate groups do not mix well. After all, it is the president—usually chosen from the ranks of faculty—who decides whether or not career development activities will be supported. And it is not unusual to hear it said that such support is not important because: there is no mobility in college administration, and

*Status refers to one's position in relation to others of the same profession, class, or social standing. "Prestige" is one's reputation or influence as a result of achievement or rank. Therefore, I speak of trading of school status for position prestige.

therefore no need to allot hard-pressed budget dollars to training; there is a constant supply of recent graduates and faculty who have either been denied tenure or who wish to move out of their laboratories into administration; and administrators with a desire to learn will somehow get the training they need (Scott 1978e).

The lack of sympathy for professional training, salaries, and prospects for mobility (Millett 1977), together with the low status of middle-managers on campus (Perkins 1973), make it small wonder that a group such as the American Association of University Administrators (AAUA) has developed. The question is why more administrators do not participate.

AAUA was founded in 1970 by six administrators at SUNY Buffalo. Now there are more than 1,600 members of AAUA, who join for reasons including the annual conference, a clearinghouse on career advancement, regular newsletters, a professional development program, and a task force that offers both individual and group help on grievances. The latter is a major service headed by lawyers and legal experts (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 22, 1978, p. 8).

The organization has not made the impact it might have and is now subject to a form of splintering after achieving a degree of maturity. This is because it has tried to include both presidents, for status, as well as middle-managers, their natural constituency, and has been directed by a group with a strong student personnel orientation. The latter is a middle-management group with relatively low status and is believed by some to be a "necessary evil" rather than an important segment of university administration (Scott 1976c).

In addition, AAUA has not attracted more members because it is "one more" organization for administrators whose time, budget, and motivation are already stretched by equally attractive organizational demands. Then too, AAUA would serve a group whose members are already well-served by specific occupational organizations. Moreover, it appears to be dominated by public institutions, which tend to be large, so that many private institution administrators think of the organization as representing the interests of schools that do not fit their profile in the important area of administrator rights.

In an excellent statement on administrator rights, McInnes (1971) comments that the principle right for an administrator is "sufficient authority to do his job"; his responsibility is to be accountable. McInnes briefly reviews the development of faculty and student statements of rights, the AASCU "Basic Rights" for presidents, and

the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators "Statement of Desirable Conditions and Standards for Maximum Effectiveness of the College Administrator." According to McInnes, the last are not sufficient statements for administrators because the AASCU statement is limited to presidents and concentrates "more on procedures than on fundamental principles and value judgments" (p. 377). McInnes then states his own principles and values.

He follows the form of the statement of student rights to present the basic freedoms of an administrator under four headings: freedom of access to the university, including the freedom to be considered for a job; freedom in his office, including the freedom to administer and be accountable; freedom on and off campus; and freedom of due process. These are the basic freedoms of a person, citizen, and member of an academic community.

Such a statement is not known widely, and the reports of ombudsmen (*Cornell Chronicle,* March 9, 1978, p. 3), AAUA, and groups such as the Organization of Professional Administrators at C. W. Post suggest that administrators are in a difficult situation. The recommendations that follow will offer suggestions for improvements.

Current Issues: Women and Minorities in Middle-Management

Until the late 1960's, women and minorities as administrators were rare in all but those colleges whose mission is was to serve women or minorities. A decade later—after much publicly expressed concern for affirmative action—women and minorities are still uncommon in collegiate administration. Nearly one-half of minority administrators are in minority institutions, which represent less than 5 percent of American collegiate institutions. While women are not limited as much to specific types of institutions—although only 1 percent in a major national survey were employed in the 21 men's colleges studied—women seem to be concentrated in a small group of jobs (Van Alstyne et al. 1977b, p. 40). One-half of white women administrators at white coeducational institutions were found in seven of 52 jobs surveyed by the College and University Personnel Association and the American Council on Education (Van Alstyne et al. 1977a). One-half of the minority women were employed in only five job categories. For minorities as a whole, two positions—affirmative action/equal employment officer and student financial aid director—account for nearly one-quarter of all employment in white public institutions and one-sixth in white private institutions (Van Alstyne 1977a). A similar situation obtains in private industry *(New York Times,* June 10, 1977, p. F12).

Affirmative action plans have succeeded in increasing the employment of women and minorities to implement the new policies but not in increasing their overall employment. Women have made no significant gains on faculties and only slight gains in administrative positions since 1972 (Lichtenstein, December 6, 1977, p. 18; Battaile 1978). Where women are employed, salaries lag behind those for men, even in equal employment officer positions (Van Alstyne et al. 1977a).

Positions where white women are concentrated include head librarian, nursing dean, bookstore manager, registrar, student financial aid director, home economics dean, and information office director; for minority women, delete the positions of home economics dean and information office director, and add affirmative action/equal employment officer. On the scale of salaries, these positions rank in the bottom one-half, with most in the bottom quartile, an indication of their relative standing (Van Alstyne et al. 1977a).

In the job category of registrar, which has a high proportion of

women (approximately 41 percent), salary data from a national survey reveal striking differences between male and female salaries, even when educational level and level of responsibility are held constant (AACRAO, pp. 16, 18). Mean salaries for females are between $2000 and $3500 less than mean salaries for males when education is considered, and between $2700 and $3200 less when the top three levels of responsibility in a registrar's office are considered (AACRAO, pp. 16, 18).

This recitation does not necessarily indict all colleges. Some have been vigorous in recruiting and promoting women and minorities, while others definitely have not. But overall figures have been affected by the closing of numerous women's colleges in the last half-decade. Two-year and four-year women's colleges, many supported previously by the Roman Catholic Church, have closed in recent years (Carnegie Council 1976, pp. 32-33).

As institutions begin to "gear down" their academic programs in preparation for periods of declining enrollments, and new retirement legislation further slows the influx of new faculty, administrative positions will probably remain an area of opportunity for employment. Increasing attention will no doubt be focused on administration as an arena for activist affirmative action.

Employment in administrative positions has increased. It grows at the base of its statistical pyramid in times of expansion and near the top in response to new and specialized requirements. It seems to me that future growth in administration will be of specialists, and thus will exacerbate already existing problems.

Men as well as women suffer from the role and relational problems examined in the chapter on "Uncertain Loyalists." They also suffer the unique fate of "tokenism." In a particularly illuminating discussion of this phenomenon and a related theory about "proportional representation," Kanter (1977, p. 208) analyzes three perceptual tendencies associated with the proportional rarity of tokens: visibility, contrast, and assimilation. First, tokens have high visibility: "they capture a larger awareness share." Second, "the presence of a person or two with different sets of social characteristics increases the self-consciousness of the numerically dominant population *and* the consciousness of observers about what makes them a group." That is, the majority becomes more aware of their commonalities and how they differ from—i.e., are in contrast to—the token. The tendency is to exaggerate the differences and isolate the token (p. 211).

The third perceptual tendency involves the use of stereotypes or

"familiar generalizations" about the token's social type. Such stereotypes actually limit the token's behavior because "it is also easier for tokens to find an instant identity by conforming to the preexisting stereotypes." Tokens are "highly visible as people who are different and yet not permitted the individuality of their own unique, nonstereotypical characteristics" (p. 211).

These perceptual tendencies are each associated with particular forces that influence the generation of typical token's responses.

> Visibility tends to create *performance pressures* on the token. Contrast leads to heightening of *dominant culture boundaries*, including isolation of the token. And assimilation results in the token's *role encapsulation* (Kanter 1977, p. 211).

Such findings exist in both industry and education and apply to both white women and minorities. They dramatize the need for successful affirmative action and an increase in absolute numbers of women and minorities employed. Women and minorities as middle-level administrators experience the same problems as others when it comes to role models, training, and mobility—only more so. To be both a middle-manager and a token can be a double curse.

Communication on Campus

The structure of an organization affects communications paths. In the complex organization known as the college or university—a sometimes tenuous fabric of collegial, political, and bureaucratic components—communication between and among components can be difficult. Typically, middle-managers do not belong to the most important decisionmaking groups on campus: the president's executive staff, the faculty council, the council of academic deans, and the instructional departments. Middle-managers have information of use to these groups but information does not bring membership. In fact, information may not even attract inquiries. More than a few mid-level administrators in my survey complained about decisions made by these more senior groups on campus, which reached conclusions hastily and without considering either data or consequences. One can argue that staff aides who are middle-managers to deans, departments, and executives should have briefed their superiors before a vote was taken. But this assumes that superiors and subordinates discuss issues and that middle-managers brief each other and neither assumption is universally valid. Middle-

managers complain about their lack of involvement in discussions about policy and that when they do offer proposals they are filtered and advanced by supervisors who are often unfamiliar with the content. As a result, the version finally discussed by senior executives is weak and must compete with numerous other items, many of which are more familiar to the policymaking group.

To avoid this condition, some campuses have established "administrative councils" comprised of mid-level administrators from various parts of the institution. Members usually include the directors of administrative offices who do not normally meet with the president's executive staff or the council of academic deans. Often the administrative council is led by a vice president.

The size of the council is influenced by its function. Most councils had 18 or fewer members and only a few had more than 50 (Scott 1978e).

There seem to be three major functions served by administrative councils: they make final decisions; they serve as a forum for communication among peers; and most commonly they serve some combination of these along with being an advisory or sounding board for newly proposed policies, procedures, and organizational structures. They provide a forum for a thorough review of proposals at the "operating" level that may be reduced to a two-minute discussion by the academic deans' council. Without such preliminary review, the full range of consequences may not be considered.

Topics of discussion include proposals for salary and classification systems, performance appraisal and staff development plans, policy and procedure manuals, lease-versus-buy plans for office equipment, inventory, management, and storage of records, affirmative action plans for exempt and nonexempt staff, and institutional responses to new governmental requirements, such as those for the handicapped and the computation of indirect costs on sponsored research projects.

The administrative council can provide a means of improving communications on campus. But to be effective it must be small, which means that some administrators are excluded. To overcome this problem, some institutions have two councils: one small and one large. The small council serves the multiple purposes discussed previously, while the large council serves primarily as an audience for the presentation of new policies and procedures. They are designed more to bolster morale than to solve problems, although low morale may be a problem to be solved.

The existence of councils does not mean that communication between middle and senior administration and among mid-level administrators is improved. Council communication may be dominated by senior staff, and members may not take advantage of the opportunities provided.

An example of an exceptional council is the Organization of Professional Administrators (OPA) at the C. W. Post Center of Long Island University. Started in 1973 by middle-managers, not by senior administrators, OPA has advanced proposals and "negotiated" programs for the improvement of administrative procedures and programs on campus. OPA members can lead slightly "schizoid" lives because some of them discuss important issues with their superiors in two roles: as a subordinate and as an OPA representative. Nevertheless, the group seems to have earned the respect of senior administration and the support of middle-managers.*

Communication among administrators can be improved by councils such as those discussed, but they do not really affect the professional status of administrators on campus.

Concerns for Liability

There are several excellent reviews of the sources of administrator liability (Hendrickson and Mangum 1977; Leslie 1978; Tice 1978; Peterson 1977). Definitions, laws, regulations, interpretations, and abstracts of cases and findings are noted and included. An excellent guide is Bickel and Brechner (1978).

Types of liability include contracts (written or oral, express or implied), tortious conduct, and criminal violations. The possibilities of and protections from personal liability in these areas are treated by Hendrickson and Mangum (1977).

Students' rights, collective bargaining, tax laws, copyright laws, employment, and promotion practices are issues that can involve legal suits and liability. Admissions practices, accuracy of catalog information, Title IX obligations, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Buckley amendment, "sunshine" laws, and investment funds are also issues, as are freedom of speech and "prior restraint," student-endorsed tours, student-sponsored activities, student-discipline actions, and campus

*At this writing, the future of OPA is clouded by the fact that the NLRB has approved a request for a collective bargaining unit comprised of certain administrators. If a unit is voted in, this development may split administrative ranks and weaken OPA.

security. This is just a sampling of the numerous other sources of liability actions.

The basic conclusion of the reviewers of sources of administrator liability is not surprising: "college and university administrators and faculty must recognize that there are legal duties that they owe to their students and that a breach of a duty can bring on a lawsuit" (Johnson and Ripps 1977, p. 44). Administrator immunity from personal liability is qualified, not absolute; one must prove that the acts complained about were done within the scope of official duties, in good faith, without malice, and with a sincere belief that only right was being done. If an official knows or reasonably should know that an action taken within his sphere of official responsibility would violate a student's constitutional rights, immunity may be withdrawn (Johnson and Ripps, pp. 38-39). In an age that describes students as "consumers" and education as an "industry," when litigious describes more and more relations and litigation seems epidemic, and when courts assume authority and responsibility in new areas (Cox 1976; Scott 1978a), the result seems obvious. Administrator liability will be of increasing concern and the ranks of college attorneys will continue to expand.*

* Commentaries are found in Hollander (1977) and Drinkwater (1978). Brubacker (1971), offers an excellent two volume set of cases. One of the most recent and complete volumes is Kaplin's *The Law of Higher Education*, 1978.

Satisfactions and Incentives for Increased Competence and Performance

Most mid-level collegiate administrators seem to be satisfied with their work (Bess and Lodahl 1969; Baldridge et al. 1978). This may be surprising in view of public interest in collegiate management issues and in view of most reports about conditions on campuses. But then most college graduates in positions that permit a degree of autonomy and provide fair pay are usually more satisfied with their work than other categories of workers (Solmon and Tierney 1977, p. 413). In *Work in America*, a special report to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, it is noted that the level of satisfaction with one's work is related to: the level of job prestige; the autonomy or control over the conditions of one's work; the cohesiveness and interaction of the work group; the challenge and variety of tasks; employer concern and the involvement of employees in decisionmaking; wages, with respect to both the amount and the worker's perception of the adequacy of the wages when compared with those of others performing similar tasks; the mobility potential of the job for upward movement through the skill hierarchy, the occupational hierarchy, and the organizational structure in which the work is performed, or any combination of the three; satisfactory working conditions; and job security (Braude 1973, pp. 36-96; see also Richardson 1976, Maccoby 1976, and Sheppard and Herrick 1972). In my research and in that of Solmon and Tierney (1977, p. 419), mid-level administrators said they were "very satisfied with their work." Even salary was cited as a reason for satisfaction.

In the Solmon and Tierney study, which rated administrators' satisfaction with a variety of job-related items, only five of nineteen categories were *not* rated positively. These were "visibility," "opportunities for vertical or lateral transfer," "opportunity for scholarly pursuits," "availability of time to spend with family," and the "opportunity for leisure time." In my study (Scott 1978e), mid-level administrators reported that most satisfaction was found in opportunities to help students and staff, and with the opportunity to act independently and to make an impact on one's organization. They reported being frustrated most with lack of time to get work done, paperwork, limited resources and staff, and the lack of recognition and appreciation for their work. Ingraham and King (1968) added the problems of understaffing and space conditions.

Given this background, several questions are examined: What incentives exist for improving competence and performance? How are competence and performance measured? How can competence and performance be improved? And what mechanisms can and should be offered to improve competence and performance?

We know that colleges and universities are sufficiently different from other forms of employing organizations (Perkins 1973; Baldridge et al. 1978), so that we must be wary of drawing analogies between corporations and colleges. Collegiate institutions have vague goals, emphasize client service and professional tasks, are "people processors" for which no *best* methods are known, employ subjective criteria, and usually have an "amateur" senior administration (Baldridge et al. 1978, p. 106; Knapp 1969). However, while the organizations differ in important ways, there are striking similarities between mid-level administrators in education and industry. In both cases mid-level administrators (or managers) have grown in number for similar reasons and in similar functions (Drucker 1973; Scott 1978e; Sofer 1970). Motivational forces are basically similar. In McClelland's terms, they share the need to achieve, the need for friendship or affiliation, and the need to assume a major role in the organization (1961).

Many of the motives cited previously are evident in collegiate middle-managers' responses to questions about existing incentives for improving skills. They list job security, personal advancement, keeping up with the complexities of the job, personal growth and satisfaction, salary increases, peer recognition, and personal pride. The latter item is cited frequently, which gives hope for some of the recommendations that will follow (Scott 1978e).

When one asks about incentives that *should* be offered, high on the list are in-house mobility, job rotation, and institutional support for staff development programs. Some respondents mention "performance evaluation," which is the chief, formal way of measuring the competence and performance of those who manage.

Performance evaluation is simply the appraisal of performance. It has always taken place, albeit in casual observation or only by inference. There is now a growing interest in making performance evaluation a formal administrative procedure in higher education.

In a capsule statement, Charles Fisher says, "the evaluation process is a review of performance vis-à-vis goal expectations and individual potential through the use of appropriate assessment techniques that involve those persons with whom the individual interacts so as to

determine areas of needed and desired professional development" (Fisher 1977a, p. 4). In this view, performance evaluation is an adjunct to training and development.

The incentives for developing performance evaluation schemes are several. Equal opportunity regulations require that employment and compensation decisions must be justified, and formal evaluation systems can provide necessary evidence. New mandatory retirement legislation may also inspire more concern for evaluation. Government officials and trustees are directly and indirectly asking administrators to be accountable for their decisions. Faculty members, both locally and through national groups, play a significant role in policy formation and administration and demand of college administrators "a consideration and an accountability significantly different from that required by . . . managers" in other organizations. In a sense they are asking for more formal appraisals of administrators, a check on quality control (*New York Times,* December 25, 1975, p. E7). Students also demand that administrators be accountable and subjected to formal evaluation (Anderson 1975, p. 4). Finally, administrators themselves ask for evaluation as a form of feedback and recognition.

In one of several excellent reviews of evaluation philosophies and practices, Genova et al. (1976) outline the goal, objectives, procedures, and dimensions of evaluation and include examples of how the concept is employed at several institutions (see also Anderson 1975; Dressel 1976; Farmer 1977; Winstead, 1977; Griffin and Burks 1976; Shoemaker 1977; and Zion 1977). Administrative evaluation, with no clear links between effective administration and student learning, must concentrate on more immediate outcomes like leading, decisionmaking, budgeting, problemsolving, and internal coordinating. It can be used for the following purposes: (1) establishing and attaining institutional goals; (2) helping individual administrators to improve their performance; (3) making decisions on retention, salary, or promotion; (4) increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of the administration as a team; (5) keeping an inventory of personnel resources for reassignment or retraining; (6) informing the governing body and administration of the degree of congruence between institutional policy and institutional action; (7) sharing governance; (8) informing internal and external audiences on administrative effectiveness and worth; and (9) conducting research on factors related to administrator effectiveness.

The effectiveness of an administrator's actions must be judged

aaginst certain dimensions of institutional context. Genova et al. (1976, p. 135) describe the actions and context in this way: Administrator actions to be evaluated include goal formation, goal attainment, resource acquisition, and membership satisfaction. These actions may be judged in the context of institutional climate, institutional authority patterns, and institutional stage of development. We want to know how well administrators perform duties, supervise others, follow through, train others, lead others, plan operations, manage operations, evaluate operations, meet objectives, maintain budgets, and how well and how often they initiate ideas and proposals for improving effectiveness. These criteria assume that regular, substantive contact and interaction takes place between supervisors and subordinates.

Plans in use are of three general kinds: rating scale systems, management-by-objective schemes, and analogs to *ad hoc* search committees. Excellent descriptions and examples may be found in Anderson (1975), Farmer (1977), and Genova et al. (1976). To be successful each program must permit the person being evaluated to share in the design and the results of the evaluation. With no agreement on objectives and criteria, little good can come of the exercise.

Indicators of the success of an evaluation program include acceptance, visibility, strong program administration, overcoming resistance, grievance procedures and legal factors, affirmative action, stages of development, and maintenance and renewal (Genova et al., pp. 43-50.

Evaluation programs are not easy to begin and may be abandoned because of reactions against them. Openness and acceptance of new ideas are giving way to guardedness and suspicion partly because of the necessity for retrenchment. Faculty may think that evaluation is an administrative tool for pruning their numbers, and administrators might see evaluation in a similar way.

It has been reported that industrial companies may be giving up management-appraisal systems because of recent challenges from the courts. Apparently even standard appraisal systems use criteria that the courts have found not sufficiently relevant and important to the job of the person evaluated. Many appraisal schemes serve conflicting purposes: ". . . is the appraisal system used to make compensation decisions [also used] to give employees feedback on performance?" (*New York Times*, October 21, 1977, p. D5 and September 23, 1977, p. D5).

Experts argue that valid tests can be constructed and that a return to the subjective reactions of supervisors will bring similar court challenges. Affirmative action and retirement legislation concerns alone should provide incentives for developing adequate evaluation methods.

Of the institutions I visited, only a few had an active, formal staff-evaluation-and-development program. Several had systems that were not understood by those interviewed, and a couple of institutions were just beginning to implement them. The Higher Education Management Institute is an Exxon Education Foundation project that is now developing materials for the evaluation and training of administrators. While such programs are well-known in industry and the military, they are rare in higher education. Colleges and universities have simply not yet acknowledged the value of career administrators and the important dimensions of their evaluation.

In an attempt to remedy this situation, administrative groups have tried to develop mechanisms of their own. For example, the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), whose constituency is alumni and development officers, has developed a program of competence training and certificating (they say it is not certifying) and the financial aid association has discussed doing the same. (For an excellent review see Davis and VanDusen, 1978, see also National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators . . . , 1978, p. 88.)

The CASE Certificate Program, a noncredit career improvement program, provides a permanent record of professional growth, an annual review of progress, and an opportunity to work with an experienced CASE member. The Program works at three levels of experience. A member may work toward the Functional Area Certificate, intended for college advancement officials with one to three years experience; or the Program Management Certificate, intended for those with three to eight years of experience; or the Executive Management Certificate, intended for advancement administrators with eight or more years of experience. The completion of each certificate should take at least three years and be completed within five years. The certificates, which are not sequential, should take at least three years to complete (CASE brochure).

Groups must be cautious, however, in trying to use a credentialing process to achieve status. One need only look at the student personnel group and take note of how far specialized training and degree programs have received professional or institutional reward.

Student support services are one of the first areas to be cut in retrenchment because there appears to be an endless need for them, there are conflicts of opinion about who should pay for them, there is no way of telling when enough are offered, there are no objective methods to evaluate whether or not they are successful, and there is no compelling argument that these services must be provided by specialists. Peers and lay people can be just as effective (Scott 1976c; Humphries 1977).

Incentives mentioned by collegiate middle-managers have been cited as job security, personal advancement, keeping up with the complexities of one's job, personal growth and satisfaction, salary increases, peer recognition, and personal pride. Some of these spring from within; others can be offered by the organization. However, institutions as such and chief executive officers do little to encourage improvement. Results are wanted in the form of competent, highly motivated staff who, similar to research faculty, are "self-starters." But similar incentives—leaves, tenure, and adequate resources—are not provided (Bowen 1978). Few institutions do more than provide funds for travel to association meetings as a form of professional development.

What can be offered to provide incentives that meet both the motivational needs of people and the productive needs of the organization? Improvements in performance result from a combination of motives (personal desires) and incentives (from within and from without) with a steady application of reinforcement, which can lead to feelings of self-esteem, satisfaction, and mastery (Bucher and Stelling 1977).

The result desired is an effective and satisfied administrator, one who can contribute to the effectiveness of the organization through goal formulation, goal attainment, resource acquisition, and membership satisfaction (Genova et al. 1976). According to Harlan Cleveland, the effective administrator is one who can deal with ambiguity, achieve consensus, possess a "can do" spirit unwarranted by expert predictions, and has a willingness to take initiative and let others take the credit (1977, pp. 23, 24).

What are the incentives for improvement? According to Cofer and Appley (1964), behavior is motivated by environmental determinants, internal urges, and goal or object values. The first kind of motivational force is environmental; the other two involve biological and psychological forces such as fear, anxiety, achievement need, affiliation needs, power, sex, hope of success, dependency, and

aggression. For this discussion, I propose that we think of the environmental as the structural, the biological as the nurturing of administrators through employment benefits, and the psychological as intrinsic and extrinsic norms and values. Many of the ideas to be proposed and reviewed under each heading may be put into effect easily; others will require senior administrator and possibly trustee action before they can be implemented. There is some overlap in categories.

Environment, or what might be called structural incentives, includes the structure of the organization itself: personnel policies and opportunities should be designed to acknowledge and develop career patterns and ensure that advancement in responsibility and rewards are possible, but not simply in a single, narrow career path. Like collegiate institutions, industry has problems of limited mobility for aspiring middle-managers, and offers such opportunities as lateral transfers, retraining programs, task force assignments, and department reorganizations (Zonana 1975). Job rotation in the college and university environment is a natural means of career development but is seldom used (Bess and Lodahl 1969; Scott 1975). Many industral firms offer newsletters or newspapers and regular briefing meetings to communicate the company's activities and offer employees a chance to question management. On-campus consultative committees, such as administrative councils, can air grievances and be useful forums for the exchange of information and the development of proposals. In most cases these councils are organized by the senior administration. Another structural mechanism consists in placing employees on an institution's board of trustees. Adequate resources are an obvious structural improvement with incentive potential.

Among the benefit incentives for middle-managers are tuition remission for spouses and children, merit pay in addition to cost-of-living adjustments, a program of leaves of absence, and even early retirement. Both government and industry have recognized the need for true merit-pay plans, but colleges and universities generally have not developed good plans for staff (*New York Times,* October 23, 1977, p. 4 and *New York Times,* February 10, 1978, p. D9; Bowen 1978, p. 26).

Leave of absence plans are also few in number. When offered by an institution, they may be for extended vacation or for professional development projects. Interesting plans are offered by Bucknell University and the University of Massachusetts.

For three years, the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) has sponsored an Exxon Education Foundation-supported program of Administrative Leave. Nominations are solicited by brochure and four administrators are selected each year. Leaves may be for advanced formal study, specialized training, internships, research, or another purposes. Leave plans in other countries are discussed in, *Educational Leaves for Employees: European Experience for American Consideration* by Konrad von Moltke and Norbert Schneevoight (1977).

The third category of incentive is the psychological. This category includes such motivations as job security, performance evaluation for feedback, recognition, high expectations and leadership by example, senior officer visits to staff offices, and trust.

Michael Maccoby (1978) has written an interesting short essay on trust, which he believes is an important element for people to do good work in jobs that do not engage their creative potentials. Trust can be built on "principles of job security, health and safety, equity, participation, and respect for individual development both within and outside of the [workplace]" (p. A27).

Appeals to psychological incentives also must make good use of the fertile ground of pride. Even the most selfless person appreciates recognition, and recognition can foster pride of institution as well as pride in self. To nurture growth, it must be recognized; internal or "psychic" rewards are not sufficient for most people.

Many psychological incentive schemes pay homage to A. H. Maslow and his theory of self-actualization. Unfortunately, such schemes often become organized around the "heirarchy of need stages" proclaimed and fail to recognize that the fullest development of personal possibilities is a continuum with a constantly receding end point. New "value-clusters"—first job security, then individual rights at work, etc.—constantly arise (Kanter 1978a, p. 4; Westin 1978, p. 18F).

Summary

This discussion of incentives for improving competence and performance is brief: many of the concepts deserve much fuller discussion and debate. We are not certain they will work, but we have some sense that they will, especially when incentives are tied to indicators of job satisfaction.

There are problems with incentive programs. More than a few respondents in my survey stated that incentives must be internal

or "all is lost." They do not want artificial motivators. But incentives for professional development can be both authentic and sincere.

One problem with using incentives as rewards is that those who are productive will gain and those who are not will fall behind even further. If only the best are rewarded and the rest are ignored, there are few gains for the organization. Because the consequences of not offering rewards seem clear, it may be that discrimination should be done on the basis of quality of effort. For a contrary view see Bess (1978). On the other hand, some middle-managers think there are disincentives to improving competence and performance. They believe the only rewards will be more work, less time, no additional money, and peer pressure.

It should be remembered that incentives that work for one person or group may not work for another. Also, incentives may vary in effectiveness at different levels of job responsibility. The person and the context must be considered.

It would be possible to end this section by saying that there is little evidence that colleges and universities will change or that on their own, presidents will encourage and support staff development and demonstrate concern for the professional "health" of mid-level administrators. "Organizations tend to be designed to minimize ambiguity," which limits the potential for challenging new experiences (Argyris 1973). But people have the capacity to grow, and, in general, "the more they orient themselves toward growth, the better [it is] for organizational health." In the final chapter several ideas for professional growth and development will be discussed.

Training and Development

While most staff development activities have been directed toward teachers, and there is a long tradition of in-service training for elementary and secondary school teachers, in recent years there has been a growth in the number of training and development opportunities for collegiate administrators. These opportunities followed closely on the heels of development programs for college faculty. Charles Fisher (1977), director of the Institute for College and University Administrators, American Council on Education (ACE), provided an excellent brief review of this topic. Gaff, Festa, and Gaff (1978) offer a more extensive review of the literature. In this section, I will offer a survey and analysis of training and development for administrators.

Causes of growth in administrator training activities are varied. Gross (1976) and Fisher (1977c) suggest several that are corroborated by my research: a new sense of management accountability; an eagerness to learn that brings many administrators to college employment in the first place; the inherent relationship between administrator evaluation and training; and the desire to keep up with new complexities and technologies. One career development expert, a professor of psychology at Pennsylvania State University and consultant to industry, argues that managers should spend 20 percent of their time keeping up-to-date by learning new techniques and reviewing significant old ones (Fowler, June 24, 1977, p. D5). Consultation with others in similar positions and reading are the most frequent sources of information for professional development and getting new ideas for job responsibilities (Scott 1976a), but such informal means can be inefficient.

A quick review of advertisements in almost every issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* shows that more formal opportunities are numerous. The *Chronicle* also publishes an annual "Calendar: A Guide to Meetings, Conventions, Seminars and Travel." A major reference is *A Guide to Professional Development Opportunities for College and University Administrators* published by ACE (Galloway and Fisher 1978).

Programs vary in sponsorship, scope, and audience. Some are sponsored by national or regional associations; some are commercial ventures; others are in the form of institutes sponsored by universities.

They range in time from a day or more to a week, and some are up to six weeks in length. The curriculum may be aimed specifically at the responsibilities of a particular set of administrators or may emphasize institutional-level planning and decisionmaking. Many administrators I interviewed expressed strong interest in the topics of budgeting, accounting, computers, legal issues, and evaluation. The audience may be middle-managers, department chairmen, deans, business officers, student personnel administrators, vice presidents, or presidents.

Staff training and development in colleges and universities face severe obstacles. While military, business, and governmental employers regularly send their executives and officers to training programs, collegiate institutions do not. Consequently, their administrators lack the sponsorship, budget, and time necessary to attend programs that exist. It is ironic that institutions of higher learning should devote such a small percentage of resources to the training of their employees. Hilton Hotels has a career development institute in Montreal, established in 1968, to which everyone from housekeepers to vice-presidents goes for training. Each hotel has a training budget. In addition, managers have other forms of training in various locations and are sent to U.S. business schools (Bender, July 23, 1976, p. D3). Xerox has an international training center in Leesburg, Virginia. The 2,000-acre campus has facilities for over 1,000 students at a time with a faculty-staff component of 250. Every middle-manager attends the special "Managing-Tasks-Through-People" course.

In 1975, the nation's 7,500 largest companies spent more than $1.6 billion for in-house education for their employees. The Conference Board study, which is the source for these figures, also found that almost 45,000 individuals work fulltime on training staffs for major corporations (Fowler, June 10, 1977; Lusterman 1977).

Military programs may be more well-known. At Cornell, which seems to attract service officers to its professional programs, one rarely meets a major or lieutenant commander who has not spent one-half or two-thirds of his military career in school. The Department of Defense spends more than $6 billion on training and education each year. Thirty percent of the nation's servicemen and officers attend school after work-hours and many more are assigned to schools. Sixty percent of the Department of Defense's salary and benefit budget goes to servicemen as students (Greenberg 1978). Federal bureau examples include the U.S. Department of Agriculture

and Civil Service Commission programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

A further difference between staff development in colleges and universities and business and the military is that the former concentrates on higher-level administrators while the latter two cover the whole spectrum of executives.

Programs for local staff do exist on many larger campuses. Some have been described in the *College and University Bulletin* (October 1976). Such programs include existing graduate-level course registration at reduced fees, formal degree programs in higher education administration, and sponsorship of administrators at programs off-campus. Nearly 300 colleges have in-house professional development programs, many with a full-time training director. Programs sponsored include seminars and workshops in fund accounting, principles of managing, using the computer, publications, assertiveness training, effective use of time, telephone techniques, discipline and grievance procedures, handling the mail, awareness training, career planning, and transactional analysis ("Training and Development Opportunities at Cornell," n.d.).

One of the complaints about off-campus programs, in addition to their cost, time, and low correlation to retention, is that they are often rushed into production in the wake of a fad. Ryan reported on the proliferation of workshops on collective bargaining when that topic was first current. There were 300 conferences on the topic in one year, with forty in the month of October alone (Ryan 1977, p. 6). There is a general lack of quality control even in those conferences cosponsored by associations (Fisher 1977c, p. 5).

If Collective Bargaining was *the* topic in 1973-74, the subject for 1978 is management, especially as it concerns women. New institutes have been created to offer training in management, from one-day "whirlwind" overviews prior to national association meetings to eight-day workshops featuring well-known authors and consultants as instructors. Annual meetings have been devoted to the topic while new programs are not yet well known but are developing good reputations. Examples are the Summer Institute for Women in Higher Education Administration co-sponsored by Bryn Mawr College and HERS (Higher Education Referral Service (three and one-half weeks, $1500)), and the Institute for Administrative Advancement at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (four weeks, $800 plus room and board). The best-known programs are those offered by The American Council on Education (ACE) and by Harvard.

The Institute for College and University Administrators of the American Council on Education was established at Harvard in 1955 and moved to ACE ten years later. By 1976, some 5,000 administrators from 1,200 colleges and universities had participated in its various week-long institutes for senior institutional officers (Fisher 1977c).

The Harvard University Institute for Educational Management, a six-week-long program begun in 1970, enrolls about 120 senior-level administrators each summer. Its fees total nearly $3000. Its curriculum covers the topics of academic personnel policy and administration, control and planning systems, educational policy and ethics, evaluation, governmental relations, labor relations, law and higher education, management information systems, managing financial resources, organizational behavior, and organizational design and decisionmaking.

Other institutes are sponsored by associations, such as the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education's (CASE) week-long summer programs in executive management, communications, educational fund raising, and alumni administration. Fees for these programs vary from $385 for CASE members to $600 for nonmembers. Both occupational and institutional associations offer workshops and seminars for the professional development of their members. It is these "invisible colleges" that come closest to meeting the needs of the majority of mid-level collegiate administrators (Boulding 1975, p. 8; see also Willingham 1970, p. 10ff). Most of the others are consciously aimed at faculty members with doctorates, women, or senior officers. They are not designed for aiding the development of middle-managers.

Higher Education has not yet realized its responsibility for the professional development of its mid-level staffs. But it is not for lack of good ideas. Charles Fisher of ACE has proposed a National Academy for Leadership Development in Postsecondary Education (1977b), a cooperative national academy "that is both a conference/training/learning center and a professional development program. . . ." The academy could help consolidate and improve the confusing array of often duplicated programs, some of which are of dubious quality. Students and faculty would represent the broad array of higher education's constituents. The idea of such an academy is not a new one, but it is not yet a reality, in part because staff development is not considered a part of organizational development (Richardson 1975). Also a good case can be made that organizational

development is not highly valued by institutions. It can be argued that the state of academic staff development in this country—in contrast to Great Britain where much is being done—is a reflection of the status and regard of administrators on campus, which is the subject of the next chapter.

Uncertain Loyalists: Role Conflicts Among Collegiate Middle-Managers

The roles and relationships of collegiate middle-managers can be understood in terms of "loyalty;" certainly lords, squires, and yeomen were expected to exhibit this trait. Loyalists was the name given to American colonists who pledged allegiance to the Crown of Britain during the War for Independence. They were on the forefront of social change and were pioneers in a dramatic experiment in social change, but they knew and honored their roots. By analogy, mid-level collegiate administrators are simultaneously loyalists to an institutional identity—in which they express pride and to which they seem dedicated (Thomas 1978)—and on the forefront of organizational changes.

We have defined the functions of collegiate middle-managers in both abstract and concrete terms. The shaping of their functions—liaison with suppliers of resources, implementation of procedures for the allocation of resources and control of activities, and work with students—creates the norms that define the positions. One's role is defined by the set of norms.

Role, which is part of both the professional and the common language of literary criticism, philosophy, theatre, and sociology, is among the most complex and fundamental concepts of society. Gordon (1972) conceptualized role as

> a pattern of behavior and sentiment, organized in relation to presumed motivations, and frequently but not always connected to a specific organizational position (p. 74).

We each enact several roles at once—director, mother, husband, active citizen—and change roles during different life stages. At each stage we face different value-theme dilemmas, such as security versus challenge, increasing versus decreasing independence of action, stability versus accomplishment, and dignity versus control. It is these dilemmas, in the form of "incompatible expectations" or demands on our roles, that pose conflicts (Carroll 1976).

Before exploring the role conflicts suggesting the theme "uncertain loyalists," the relationships of collegiate middle-managers to others will be examined. These relationships contribute to a sense of belonging, socialization to role, and levels of satisfaction. The

three dimensions of relationships that will be explored are: salaries as gross indicators of status relationships; informal interactions with others; and official interactions with others.

Each year, several agencies report average salaries for administrators by institutional size, type, and control (i.e. public versus private). Other agencies report faculty salaries in a similar format. Still other sources report salaries for industry and government officials. Since each source may use different size samples of varying representativeness, one cannot accept these comparisons as absolute. But they suggest directions of difference; as such, they are useful as estimators.

The National Center for Education Statistics in 1977 (*Higher Education and National Affairs,* August 5, 1977, p. 6), gave mean salaries for college administrators in 1976-77, shown in Table 3.

*Table 3. Mean Salaries of College Administrators**

Position	Mean Salary	No. of Officers in Sample
Presidents and chancellors	$34,805	2362
Chief academic officer	27,448	2211
Chief business officer	24,696	2239
Chief development officer	23,303	1294
Chief student life officer	22,524	1871
Director of computer center	20,790	1067
Director of student counseling	18,965	1095
Chief librarian	18,791	2192
Director of admissions	18,725	1826
Director of physical plant	17,853	1628
Chief public relations officer	17,712	1163
Registrar	16,516	1695
Director of financial aid	11,956	1268
Bookstore manager	11,956	1268

* Based on data from the American Association of University Professors, 1977-78.

Mean salaries vary by institutional size, type, and control and by the age of position holders. Salaries in 1977-78 averaged 8.5 percent higher (*The Chronicle of Higher Education,* May 15, 1978, p. 8).

Let us assume that salaries of different officers are in relationship to each other and that salary levels of administrators in educational institutions are influenced by salary levels in business and government. The differences between salaries for financial aid officers ($11,956), for example, and those for registrars ($16,516), public relations officers ($17,712), and admissions officers ($18,723) are dramatic. The problems of status for financial aid officers have been described by Scott (1978c).

Other comparisons can be equally striking. For example, company presidents average $111,000 a year in base salary and $40,000 more in incentives (Fowler 1978), more than four times as much as college and university presidents earn. Mid-level corporate managers earn between $25,000 and $75,000, or between two and five times as much as mid-level collegiate administrators.

Bowen (1978, p. 38) has calculated comparisons of executive salaries in higher education and private business according to size and annual revenues of organization. His findings corroborate those just cited and add more detail. For example, he compares the average salary of chief business officers in higher education ($29,600 at a medium-sized institution) to the average salary of top financial executives in medium-sized business ($61,100); admissions directors to top marketing executives ($21,000 to $60,300); controllers to controllers ($29,900 to $39,400); and purchasing directors to purchasing executives ($16,100 to $35,500).

Federal Civil Service grades 1-18 cover beginning clerks to senior administrators. Most entry level positions for someone with a bachelor's degree are GS-5 and pay $9,959. For a bachelor's degree with exceptional grades, the entering civil servant may be classified GS-7 and receive $12,336. With a master's degree, one qualifies for GS-9 and $15,090. A doctorate commands either a GS-11 at $18,258 or a GS-12 at $21,883.

As one case example of federal civil service salaries, the office of the Assistant Secretary for Education in DHEW, which among other responsibilities includes the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education and the National Center for Education Statistics, shows an average GS grade of 10.5 for its staff. The average GS salary paid is $24,094 (*Appendix to the Budget,* Fiscal Year 1979). Of 3,700 positions in the Office of Education, 1,563, i.e. nearly

one-half, are GS-12 or above earning at least $21,883 per year (*Appendix to the Budget . . .*, p. 829, 1977 fiscal year).

Only in the very largest universities would salaries for administrators be in this range of government salaries. For example, Bowen estimates that in higher education the top four central administrators averaged $30,800 in salary compared to the GS-18 average of $48,700 (Bowen 1978).

Perhaps the most reasonable comparison is between faculty and collegiate administrator salaries. For 1977, nine-month faculty compensation ranged as follows (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 11, 1977, pp. 8-10):

Table 4. Faculty Compensation by Rank and Institutional Category•

		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
AAUP Category I				
(university offering	80%ile	$31,310	$23,230	$18,970
doctoral program)	20%ile	24,830	19,770	16,240
AAUP Category II				
(colleges offering	80%ile	27,050	21,960	18,040
more than bachelor's degrees)	20%ile	19,430	16,810	14,320
AAUP Category IIB				
(colleges offering	80%ile	23,780	19,190	15,910
only a bachelor's degree)	20%ile	17,320	14,770	12,580

• Based on data from the College and University Personnel Association, 1976-77.

Salaries are good indicators of the value placed on positions. Clearly, many mid-level collegiate administrator positions are not valued highly in these terms either by their institutions or by society.

But what about formal and informal relationships between positions and with others on campus? Middle-managers are evenly divided on the question of whether their professional roles have become more or less independent of others; however, they are overwhelmingly in agreement that the administrative organization of their institutions has become more complex (Scott 1978e). Most

also state that their office's responsibilities have become more greatly specialized (Scott 1978e).

Although the degree of specialization has increased, many middle-managers now report to a lower-level institutional officer than ten years ago. As demands on collegiate organizations have become more complex, there has been both growth and differentiation of administrative positions, and a resulting reduction in status for many positions. Some administrators who used to report to the president now report to a vice president or an associate provost (see Vinson 1977; Whitmire 1978).

Middle-managers have interchange on campus with other administrators, the executive staff of the president, faculty, students, and trustees. These relations may be formal or informal, one-to-one or in groups. The more frequent the interchange, the more likely it will be informal. Many middle-managers have regular and substantial contacts with these others, except for trustees, although many do see trustees informally once a month (Scott 1978e). However, the nature of these relationships makes the socialization of new administrators difficult. Role models and significant others are obscure, and may more often include national association colleagues or federal bureau representatives than campus supervisors. The literature on middle-managers, scant as it is, includes many references to the lack of consideration or respect shown (Baumgartel 1976) and to the "step-sister" status (Thomas 1978) accorded them by senior administrators and faculty. This condition, together with the fact that middle-managers have little involvement in either the central missions or the determination of goals of their institutions, places a strain on the degree of loyalty or organizational commitment shown by them.

Relations with faculty are particularly troubled. Faculty seem to regard the growing ranks of collegiate administrators as a "not-quite necessary evil." The critical campus organization for faculty is the department, which usually is small, possesses highly defined goals, and is unencumbered by much administrative apparatus. The need for large central staffs is not always apparent, or justified. By the same taken, some middle-managers have little appreciation for the role of faculty. In both cases, a primary cause for such feelings seems to be the lack of interaction and consequent lack of understanding between them. Another cause seems to be that the values and frames of reference of each group are very different. In their cumulative effect, these causes have resulted in a lack of mutual

respect and regard for the "professionalism" of the other.*

As has been discussed elsewhere (e.g., Caplow and McGee 1958; Jencks and Riesman 1968), faculty, especially younger ones and those at institutions with selective admission, are very often oriented more toward their academic disciplines than to the colleges or universities that pay their salaries. This frame of reference is really quite different from that of all but a few administrators.

It is true that administrative roles are reaching new levels of sophistication. For the most part, however, middle-management positions do not require unique forms of advanced training: there is no "M.S. in purchasing for colleges and universities." Most training takes place on the job (Scott 1977b). Nevertheless, middle-managers consider themselves professionals and are encouraged in their thinking by national associations that schedule meetings of people who have similar jobs, sponsor codes of ethics, and encourage the sharing of both basic, or fundamental, and specialized information necessary for effective performance. Brooks (1973) suggests that these are the conditions of a professional, because he is someone who is "an expert 'with specialized knowledge' . . . and who shares a corporate 'sense of organic unity and consciousness' with others of similar competence." Studies of particular middle-management positions emphasize these considerations and the importance of the posts (Campbell 1978; Davis and Van Dusen 1978; Russel and Galin 1978; Stewart 1978). Campbell's mission in his article is to "convince others that admissions is the veritable life blood of the institution."

However, it bears reiteration that the value of the middle-management role is not highly respected by faculty and senior staff on campus (Baldridge et al. 1978; Baumgartel 1976; Thomas 1978). Even with the greater degree of specialization required in their jobs, they are not granted full membership in the academic community—And middle managers want this membership, not just "good schools for the kids" and football games (Thomas 1978). But the faculty is the defining element of the institution, and they determine the conditions for membership.

Obviously not all middle-managers feel the scorn of faculty. Many, especially academic deans' staff and financial aid officers, have regular contact with both faculty and students. However, there are college

*The literature on faculty-administration strains is voluminous. One of the best portrayals is also one of the oldest: Thorsten Veblen's *The Higher Learning in America* (1918).

administrators who have little or no direct contact with either, and whose contact is primarily about contracts and other forms of "business" paperwork. These mid-level administrators differ from others on campus in two significant ways. Not only do they have virtually no involvement with teachers and learners in their primary roles, but also these administrators identify themselves as professionals comparable to persons doing similar work in both collegiate institutions and industry. Most traditional collegiate middle-manager positions have for frames of references only similar collegiate positions that originated in the academy. But the new, fast-growing positions in personnel and finance brought to campuses in response to federal requirements and the need for better financial management have their origins in business and are being staffed on campus by persons from industry. They identify not only with a specialized field but also with an entirely different context and set of values. Financial aid principles, policies, and procedures are informed by the fact that financial aid is a unique collegiate function. The same cannot be said for personnel and financial responsibilities. I believe it is the increasing influence of these positions—with their different frames of reference and values—that places renewed strain on faculty-administrative relations.

In each stage of life one can assume several roles at once. In each role, we can experience conflicts because of competing role demands. We learn how to adjust to these potential conflicts gradually, through a variety of learning experiences available to us as children and young adults, and this socialization limits the possibility of our being immobilized by such conflict. Resolution of these conflicts is affected by how we deal with "approach-avoidance" or value-theme dilemmas.

Among collegiate middle-managers, the competing themes of security versus challenge, increasing versus decreasing independence of action, and stability versus accomplishment, influence the resolution of role conflicts introduced by both structural causes—the peculiar institutional organization that is part collegial, part political, and part bureaucratic—and situational causes, or the particular style of the institution. One such conflict involves the lack of validation for the middle-manager's role: They are considered experts off-campus but they are often ignored on-campus. They possess specialized information that is frequently not used by policymakers. They express pride in their institutions but do not feel appreciated by them (Thomas 1978).

They also experience a lack of role clarification as administrators. Standards, expectations, and directions are often confused, as their constituents send conflicting signals to them. Middle-managers are to be servants to students and faculty (to "hold their coats," according to Doris Grumbach (1978), and instruments of institutional policy set by senior administrators and trustees. They are to be both servants (as support staff) and policemen (as monitors of procedures). They are generally overworked and suffer from inadequate facilities and insufficient staff help (Ingraham and King 1968; Thomas 1978). They have, indeed, achieved only "grudging acceptance" (Perkins 1973, p. 8). Glenny (1972) calls them "anonymous leaders."

Professional associations and job demands encourage the development of specialized knowledge and skills, but institutions do not reward it. However, while institutions do not offer sufficient rewards as reinforcement, national associations do (Scott 1978d). As a result, role models for professional behavior are often found off-campus, not on. This is an important concern because role models are the sources for learning how to behave in one's role, and can become important in the development of one's career. Without such relationships, and with little contact across "chains of command," institutional loyalty, so plentiful when the middle-manager begins to work, begins to attenuate. Like other professionals, "middle-managers develop high professional loyalty at the expense of institutional loyalty" (Leavitt 1978, p. 158). Their self-esteem and sense of mastery as professionals are developed on-campus but confirmed off-campus.

Role conflicts can result in "no-risk actions and self-defeating behavior. When in formal relations with faculty, the holders of highest status on campus, even the most expert of middle-managers can find himself in the position of a "go-fer." Such relations can force administrators into a limited caricatured, and obsequious role, in which they are likely to be ineffective and stumble, which then adds to the lack of respect between faculty and administrators (Thomas 1978, p. 18). The assistant professor, for example, thinks the assistant dean is a powerful authority, while the assistant dean thinks of the assistant professor as having more authority than himself. The result can be a limited, awkward relationship, hardly what is needed for the accomplishment of common goals. But that is the rub. Unlike a corporation, which has profit as a superordinate goal, educational institutions have a variety of goals, with none universally acclaimed. One learns either to tolerate ambiguity or become in-

effective. And the feeling of powerlessness tends to encourage middle-managers to become rule-minded and defensive about their domain. This reaction is not unique to higher education (Kanter 1978b).

Some role conflict among middle-managers appears to be sought, even if unwittingly. Each role one assumes has a set of obligatory norms for behavior (Popitz 1972). When the administrator becomes a student in the graduate program at the institution in which he works, which should not be discouraged, he invites role conflict. If he was an undergraduate at the same institution, the situation becomes even more complex. The student role has different obligations than the administrator role. Many middle-managers are in this situation.

In some institutions, usually small, residential colleges, directors of financial aid and deans of students also teach. These relationships, too, can result in conflicts over authority and role.

Conflicts in occupational roles (when one is charged both to serve and to control) can undermine administrative effectiveness and encourage the transfer of energy from one's institution to other agencies. They affect one's feelings of identity as a professional, commitment to one's work, and loyalty to one's organization (Bucher and Stelling 1977). Weak salaries and a decline in status, at a time when specialized demands are increasing, are serious agents of conflict. The total effect of such dysfunctioning is difficult to determine, but certainly incentives can be offered to help limit them. The alternative is to invite still more regulations of poorly administered institutions. Without loyalty to institutional aspirations, the administration will be much less than fully effective.

Summary

Middle-managers work in a complex setting that is part bureaucratic, part collegial, and part political (Baldridge et al. 1978). They are "loyalists" to begin with, and many strive to maintain allegiance to their institution. But the pressures and attractions of professional work, together with the general lack of regard for administrators by faculty, encourage middle managers to question their loyalty and commitment. Like lords, squires, and yeomen, they feel a calling for service to a mission, but they feel inhibited by the strict hierarchical ranking of status levels on campus. Mobility is limited to a circumscribed arena. Few are tapped for higher status. Rewards are limited. And, finally, loyalty becomes uncertain.

Associations: The Off-Campus Organizations

For collegiate middle-managers, national associations provide peers, recognition, training, direction, guidance, rewards, and information about their jobs and their profession's standing. Top educational administrators are typically represented through institutional associations, such as the American Council on Education (ACE), the major umbrella organization for institutions and other associations, and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the Association of American Colleges (AAC), the Association of American Universities (AAU), the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges (CASC), the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU). and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). There are more specialized groups as well.

Mid-level administrators belong to the associations with position designations, such as the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA), the Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA), the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA), the National Association of College Admissions Counselors (NACAC), the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (alumni and development officers) (CASE), the National Association of College and University Attorneys (NACUA), American Association of Affirmative Action (AAAA) Officers, and the National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA). Other associations exist for career counselors, campus insurance administrators, bookstore managers, buyers, and life-safety officers. One of the newest is an informal association of bursars.

Institutional associations have been described quite thoroughly in Bailey (1975), King (1975), Murray (1976), and Wolanin (1976. Bender (1977) has brief but cogent remarks about them. However, not much has been written about the associations for collegiate middle-managers, except for their own members. Therefore, the development and purposes of these associations will be described as well as their effects on constituents.

Most professional associations begin in similar ways. One person

thinks it would be beneficial for others with similar responsibilities to meet, compare problems and resources, and discuss possible solutions and standards. Clifford Constance, who edited the historical review of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, includes this section:

> On February 26, 1910, Mr. A. W. Yoder, the financial secretary, and Mr. Alfred H. Parrott, the registrar of North Dakota Agricultural College, sent a letter to most of the registrars and accountants in the state colleges and universities, pointing out the advisability of their holding a meeting for the purpose of discussing subjects and problems of common interest, and asking them whether they would attend such a meeting . . .
> To this letter about sixty replies were received. . . . At least forty-six . . . were so enthusiastic that it was decided to call a conference. . . . Each person who had responded . . . was urged to be present 'with at least one suggestion or one question' (Constance 1973, pp. 2, 3).

They met at Detroit High School on August 15, 1910. In that modest beginning—modest in setting and number, but not in geographic representation: the twenty-four in attendance represented 21 states—two great associations find their origins. For shortly after the meeting began,

> These college accountants decided that since their work, problems, and methods differed greatly from those of college registrars, it would be more advantageous for them to hold a separate meeting and to form an independent association (Constance 1973, pp. 2, 3).

At that meeting, the registrars discussed topics that are still important to them and are important to every collegiate middle-manager: duties and functions, procedures, communications with faculty and students, reports, problems, and questions of confidentiality and disclosure. The meeting even included a report on current research, "A very detailed study of the functions of college registrars in ten representative 'land-grant' institutions." Before the conference was adjourned, the participants decided to form a permanent national organization of college registrars. The second host was M.I.T. Today, AACRAO has more than 6,600 active members from 1,950 institutions, eight paid staff, and a budget of nearly $600,000.

The seeds for the national associations were planted earlier with an informal meeting of mid-western college Secretaries and comptrollers, who were convened by a consultant for the Carnegie Foundation. The object of that meeting was to design a set of forms to be used by the Carnegie Foundation in securing annual reports from colleges and universities. After the consultant left the meeting, the college repre-

sentatives voted formally to meet annually (Constance 1973, p. 4).

At the time of these meetings, college presidents and professors in several disciplines met to discuss common interests, but administrative positions were still in an early stage of development. However, once accountants, registrars, and Secretaries began meeting, other groups developed, as these occupations grew in specialization. The process of development took two forms: splintering from a large group, and starting from a small, usually informal gathering of officials from the same region.

Today, most higher education associations have headquarters with paid staff in Washington, D.C. These are relatively recent phenomena that follow naturally from association purposes and national forces. According to Bailey, the dramatic increase in federal contracts, grants, and formula aid in the 1950's and 1960's, and the consequent rules and regulations, "served as a magnet to draw distant association headquarters like iron filings to the field of force of the nation's capital" (1975, p. ix). Law firms and trade associations are attracted by the same magnet (Roberts, January 11, 1978, p. L9; Roberts, March 4, 1978, p. 23).

At first, associations like NASFAA had an elected, volunteer financial aid administrator as its chief executive. In the late 1960's, an aid administrator at a university located in Washington, D.C. was asked to serve as a one-half-time paid executive. A short time later, in 1972, the first full-time paid executive was appointed. By 1977, the association had three full-time paid staff in their rented office building quarters (Dallas Martin, Executive Secretary; interview June 15, 1977). APPA had similar beginnings. The first full-time staff were appointed in 1972, with a budget of $56,000. By 1977, the association had nine full-time staff and were planning to add another. The annual budget was nearly $500,000, only 31 percent of which came from dues (Paul Knapp, Executive Director; interview, June 16, 1977 and letter to the author, August 10, 1978).

While the associations under discussion serve specific audiences, their purposes sound surprisingly similar. Substitute "registrar" or "physical plant administrator" or "personnel officer" or "college attorney" for business and related terms in the following and you would have an approximation of the statement of objectives for those associations.

> NACUBO's objectives are (1) to encourage excellence and creative leadership in business and financial management in higher education; (2) to make available to higher education at the national level the judgment and experience of the business office professional; (3) to open channels

> of communication on problems of business management that are important to higher education; (4) to give the business officer continuing opportunity for professional contact, expression, and growth; and (5) to cultivate professional attitudes, ideals, and standards (NACUBO 1976, p. 38).

To fulfill their objectives, associations engage in a variety of activities. Some are sponsored by state or regional branches of the national group; others are sponsored by the national group itself. These activities can be divided into three general categories: professional programs, research and publications, and committees or commissions.

Professional programs include annual meetings, regional and topical conferences, workshops, seminars and other forms of study programs, and summer institutes. Research and publications include association, foundation, and government-sponsored projects conducted by association members, staff, or other specialists; quarterly or monthly journals, periodic newsletters, monographs, manuals and guide books, bulletins, occasional papers, and library services. Committees or commissions of members and staff and other experts (practitioners and scholars) study and report on the concerns of the association covering such items as policies, procedures, government regulations, taxation and philanthropy, special needs, postal regulations and service, and energy policies.

One service of increasing importance is the monitoring of federal activity of concern to colleges and universities, and the reporting of new developments to the campuses as well as the representation of campus concerns before government agencies and committees. An important function is to help arrange for presidents of different types of institutions to testify on critical issues such as Veterans' Administration and privacy regulations, and the paperwork burden associated with many federal requirements.

In these activities, associations try to work together with one or another of the institutional or professional groups taking the lead. NACUBO took the lead on paperwork problems, AACRAO on Veterans Administration regulations, CUPA spearheaded many of the efforts associated with compliance to regulations concerned with handicapped students and employees, and APPA has become a chief force in representing higher education's interests in the development of a national energy policy. On some issues, especially financial aid and the exchange of legal information, many associations want to be in the forefront and some duplication of effort seems inevitable.

One of the major acts of coordination was to build a National Center for Higher Education at One Dupont Circle in Washington, D.C.

Most of the institutional associations and many of the major groups representing specific functional or professional interests are headquartered there or at the new companion building, Eleven Dupont Circle, which was constructed in 1977. Those not housed at One Dupont Circle participate in the joint efforts sponsored by ACE and other pilot organizations. A small Coordinating Committee meets twice a year to discuss long-range issues, the larger Secretariat meets monthly for more detailed discussion, and the influential Committee on Governmental Relations of NACUBO meets twice a week for discussions of strategy and assignments that are described by Bailey (1975), Bender (1977), Murray (1976), King (1975), and Wolanin (1976) in their works cited earlier. The task of these groups can be called lobbying, although that word has connotations that officials in educational associations want to avoid. It is important to them to provide information to government officials as well as to help orient, train, and involve their members in association activities. Protection of the group is an important part of advancing its interests and its status.

Two topics deserve further treatment before some conclusions can be made about associations as organizations of importance to collegiate middle-managers. The first is the members themselves and the second is the executive directors of the associations.

Nearly every association conducts a membership survey every few years. In part, this is a matter of curiosity, but it is also good marketing strategy. For once established, national associations, like any other organizations, want to survive by serving their membership. Obviously, one must know who is being served. Interesting survey results may be found in *CASE Currents* (Raley 1978), the *NACAC Journal* (Whitmire 1978), other association journals, or by writing to the associations. A succinct review of middle-managers' associations is found in "Profile," a description of the College and University Interassociation Management Related Group (NACUBO 1976).

In my interviews and survey of collegiate administrators, I found that membership activity may be classified on four levels: forerunners, actives, identifiers, and inactives. Forerunners are the leaders or statesmen in their field. Together with officials of similar expertness from institutions across the country, they form the basic cadre from which officers are elected and planning committees are selected, and on which professional role models are based. They also write articles and lead discussions on current issues. Forerunners are typically drawn from a relatively small group of similar institutions and may meet informally outside the auspices of the association. In some cases their success at

developing a professional association has been so great that they no longer feel they can gain from it; new members face different levels of complexity than the forerunners, who find they gain less and less from the association—they give, but receive less in return each year.

This is not to say that new leaders do not emerge from the ranks of the actives, who are members that attend meetings and contribute to the development of the organization. Almost by definition they are from large or elite, well-endowed institutions with budgets to permit travel to conferences and meetings. Associations pay for officers' travel, but one must be active and visible before he becomes an officer. The association is, in a sense, pushed forward by those from the most complex institutions.

Identifiers are frustrated: they work in smaller schools with small budgets and travel is severely limited, so participation is limited to reading association materials or to attendance at major meetings when they are held in a nearby city. Identifiers feel that they are members of a profession, but have little opportunity to associate with colleagues.

Inactives are at institutions of all sizes: they do not associate with their professional group, and do not seem to miss it. I found few of this type.

Membership profiles are especially interesting when they are compared over time. As collegiate middle-management becomes more complex, the educational attainments and interests of members advance. For example, not many years ago APPA members were more like senior building custodians than engineers. But the campus construction boom of the early 1960's and the increasing use of elevators, air conditioning, and other complex equipment, as well as new and more sophisticated building techniques, demanded a higher level of training. Now the profile of active members shows an engineer, often with a master's degree in Business Administration, as the representative person (Paul Knapp 1969). Other associations show comparable changes.

Membership also seems to vary with the dues structure of the association. In some cases, membership is an individual matter; in other cases, it is institutional. The latter condition is desired because it yields more funds, greater financial stability, and a higher level of status among associations. But it also reduces the number of "voting" members, and on some campuses it seems that the voting or official representative, who is almost always the director of the office, is the only one to participate in association activities.

The full-time executive directors of associations are an interesting group. Some have many years experience in their field, but quite a few do not. Mobility for an association executive is similar to mobility for a registrar: he must move to a larger organization. As a consequence, not all have experience in the field whose professionals they represent. King describes these executives as highly educated, well paid, and mostly WASPs (1975). Many belong to their own association, the American Society of Association Executives, which is comprised mainly of business association administrators and has both regional and national membership groups. Twenty-one belong to the College and University Interassociation Management Related Group.

While parts of higher education are now experiencing retrenchment, associations are still growing in complexity and staff size. In 1977, the Association of American Universities, which represents about sixty national research universities, doubled the size of its staff and almost trebled its annual dues per institution to $12,000.

Associations are important organizations for middle-managers. They provide and enhance identity, information, status, and recognition. These are important benefits, but there are problems too. The major one results from increased specialization, which associations assist. With increased specialization of each occupational group, it is more difficult for them to cooperate and coordinate with other groups. This has consequences for activities both in Washington and on campus. In Washington, this means it becomes more difficult to control duplication of effort on behalf of key issues, such as federal financial aid and making the most effective use of resources. It also means that personnel officers and physical plant administrators want to be independent of business officers, from which organization they began. This leads to conflicts among several associations about resources and role of NACUBO, whose annual budget exceeds $2 million dollars and whose officers are central to the discussion of most major issues.

A similar phenomenon occurs on campus. There, too, middle-managers differ in power, status, and opportunity; the strong want to lead, while the weaker want to emerge as at least independent.

Specialization also spawns certain campus dysfunctions. Mid-level collegiate administrators, who share much in common, are more likely to provide critical job information to senior administrators and peers off-campus than to colleagues on campus (Scott 1977a, 1977b). For example, NACUBO provides excellent newsletters and special bulletins about new federal requirements, but these publications usually have rather limited circulation on campus. Some mid-level

administrators, such as attorneys and personnel officers, will have delayed access to them, while others, who may also "need to know" may be outside the orbit of campus circulation. As a result, they must rely on others, or urge their own association to establish a Washington "hot-line." Information is the key to status, and NACUBO provides more and better information than most occupational associations.

In their struggle for status, middle-managers and their associations have emphasized the importance of specialization and the use of specialized knowledge. When this has been done effectively, it has strengthened their position on campus. But specialization tends to load certain communication links (to senior administrators and to associations) and place relatively less importance on others (campus middle-managers and faculty). One can argue that middle-managers expect other specialized channels to convey information to faculty. For example, the provost may be the appropriate channel for equal employment and mandatory retirement legislation requirements. But that circuit can carry only so many messages and there are many other topics of information: explanations of TIAA-CREF mailings, the effects of a new minimum wage on department employment of part-time help, and others (Scott 1977a).

It is difficult to argue as persuasively that each middle-manager office should expect another to provide critical information to middle-managers who also have a "need to know." The demand for information, guidance, and training is so great that each mid-level administrator wants timely data and ready access to it. When you add to this the desire for recognition and the status that comes from being part of a recognized group, it is easy to understand the dramatic growth of complex national associations as important organizations for middle-managers.

Summary, Recommendations, and Implications

What Should Presidents Do and Why?

Before addressing *what* the president of a college or university can do, one must consider *why* he should do anything about the condition of campus middle-managers. The answer has three dimensions. The first is a practical consideration: most presidents want to be identified with effective administrations. The second is also concerned with a practical consequence, but it is different: the tone of administration is really set by the president and he should be conscious of the results of his leadership style (see Bogue 1978). The third dimension is political: colleges and universities are under enormous pressure to change from being like private, family-owned companies dominated by relatives to becoming more like publicly held corporations and being just as accountable for their actions (Scott 1978a).

First, presidents want to be identified with effective administration, which comprises goal formulation, goal attainment, resource acquisition, and membership satisfaction (Genova et al. 1976). To establish an effective administration, the president should be certain that middle managers are competent, satisfied, and committed to the institution or else they will have a staff with either high turnover or bored people. Second, the manner in which these activities are carried out is influenced greatly by presidential leadership style (Baumgartel 1976, p. 23; Henderson and Henderson 1974, p. 20; Brooks 1973, p. 432). Third, federal, state and corporate trustee requirements for administrative accountability in academic, financial, and personnel matters carry such severe sanctions that presidents are well-advised to be concerned about how campus authorities conduct their business.

Therefore, since mid-level collegiate administration is really an extension of the president because he or she cannot possibly answer all inquiries and make all decisions, it is incumbent on the president to be concerned with the professional health and condition of his subordinate officers. The manner in which they conduct their affairs will affect the president's relations with faculty and outside groups His ability to control the growth of administration will depend on his knowledge of it.

Given that something should be done, the following recommenda-

tions are offered for college presidents and provosts:

(1) Make use of what is known about job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Develop incentives that reinforce major job satisfactions (e.g. opportunities to (a) help students and staff, (b) to act independently, and (c) to make an impact on the organization) and programs that deal with areas of frustration (e.g. lack of staff, poor workspace, emphasis on paperwork, and lack of recognition and appreciation for their work).

(2) Provide mechanisms for feedback to middle-managers about their successes and shortcomings. Most people need external stimuli and reactions. Make sure that middle-management jobs have opportunities for success, professional growth, training, and an adequate salary structure. Presidents say they want "self-starters" and compare administrators to faculty. But they do not provide similar environmental conditions, rewards, and incentives, such as sabbatical leave programs and tenure.

(3) Be concerned about the environment for innovation. Many administrators see their organizations as relatively constraining. They find there is little expectation that they will try out new ideas; they have little or no freedom to set their own personal performance goals; top management shows little "consideration" for middle managers; and communication is not "free" and "open" (Baumgartel 1976, pp. 32 and 33). Develop an atmosphere of trust and respect (Maccoby 1978).

(4) Recognize the value to the individuals and to the organization of broad participation in goal-setting activities. This is almost an imperative in the development of professional identity, integration, and commitment. Encourage the development of administrative councils and similar structures. Consider new dimensions to roles of middle-managers. In Britain, for example, middle-managers are accorded much more dignity than in either Canada or the U.S. We can learn by studying new methods of career development and organization, and the role of British administrators in institutional decisionmaking (Greenaway 1977).

(5) Encourage career alternatives and mobility within your organization. Because expectations are low and administrative structures flat, there is no tradition for much internal mobility in administration. Current, concern for professional growth and mobility runs against concern for Affirmative Action, which is often interpreted as allowing promotion only within specified career ladders. But on most campuses there are either no career ladders or very

short ones. For example, if there is a four-person office of admissions and a one-person office of financial aid that needs a new director, it should be possible to appoint to that position a bright admission's officer who may leave the college because he or she wants and deserves new professional challenges and rewards. The dilemma of internal mobility and Affirmative Action is of such magnitude that it requires special attention.

Middle-managers want to learn, be challenged, and be appreciated. Not all regard upward mobility as their prime goal. The opportunity for new challenges and significant contributions of effort toward the achievement of campus goals is equally important. Renewed attention must be given to collegiate organizations and the degree of mobility possible within them, both upward and especially lateral. Middle-managers may even be able to contribute to the development of new curricula in areas of interest to students.

Only by understanding the roles, functions, and needs of mid-level administrators, and by making the best use of them as extensions of the presidency, will colleges and universities be able to exercise some control over the rise of administrative costs*

What Can Middle-Managers Do for Themselves?

It seems clear to me that there is little evidence that colleges and universities will change soon, meaning that on their own, presidents will probably not encourage and support staff development and demonstrate concern for the professional health of mid-level administrators.

If presidents won't propose change, who will? The faculty? Students? Trustees? Government in its several forms? But perhaps middle-managers should take the initiative. In most cases middle-managers have the capacity and the freedom to develop and propose changes in the incentives and training available to improve both competence and performance. Much can be done from below in an organization if the right attitudes exist. In the words of Harlan Cleveland (1974, p. 31), there is a set of attitudes which are indispensable to the management of complexity: the notion that crises are normal, tensions are promising, and complexity is fun; the understanding that paranoia and self-pity are reserved for non-executives; the conviction that there must be some more upbeat

* For an analysis of the effects of federal compliance requirements on the expansion of administrative positions and the increase in staff costs, see Scott, 1978a, which concludes that these forms of growth result more from institutional behavior and style than from the regulations alone.

outcome than would result from the sum of available expert advice; and a sense of personal responsibility for the situation as a whole.

Since these attitudes already exist in large measure among many middle-managers, the next steps for growth seem within reach. It is only up to them to make the first move.

Here are some specific first moves:

(1) Be visible. Participate in the educational life of the college. Be active in committee work and advising; eat with the faculty; work with the departments and deans. Keep them informed about your work and ideas for theirs. Distribute reports widely; keep your faculty informed about national developments in curricula, placement testing, and trends in enrollment. For example, if you are a personnel officer, when was the last time you offered to help a dean plan for the impact of an increase in the minimum wage on next year's budget? When was the last time you offered to review that recent TIAA-CREF mailing at a faculty meeting? When did you last offer to help a new dean or department chairperson understand the employment regulations that will affect him or her? Even if he has a career administrator or a seasoned aide, can you be sure that he knows (Scott 1977b, 1977c). With the help of others, start an administrative council or similar organization for discussion and proposals concerning the educational and work environment of the institution.

(2) Develop and demonstrate skills in forecasting, planning, and budgeting. Know the literature of higher education; know where to find studies that will help your work and that of your colleagues and faculty committees. Become familiar with the resources of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

(3) Analyze your institution's structure and propose paths for professional and intellectual development. In addition to courses and degrees, look into exchanges with departments on your own and other campuses. Much can be learned by doing your own job in a different setting and by applying your skills to special, short-term projects. Identify possible promotion patterns in the organization and suggest them to your senior administrators.

Almost every college has faculty in accounting, sociology, and psychology qualified to teach courses in managerial and fund accounting, organizational behavior, and communications. These are areas of need expressed by middle-managers, and such work could be offered in short courses on campuses at little expense. But some-

one has to propose and organize them.

Administrative departments should be encouraged to visit, *en masse,* equivalent staffs at nearby colleges. Exchange visits. It is amazing how helpful it can be to spend just one day in another institution's shop. Your staff will learn two useful things: some new ideas and how good their own ideas are (Scott 1975, 1978a).

There is a tendency for middle managers, and others in bureaucratic positions, to specialize intensively to make themselves ever more proficient and indispensable. To consider a short-term job in a different context is a foreign thought. Actually, beyond a certain plateau, it is the administrator's imagination and talents for thinking, written and oral expression, and organization, not his knowledge of a particular field, that are important both for effectiveness and continued growth.

(4) Demonstrate your professionalism; don't ask for status. Faculty rank and special voting privileges for full-time, nonteaching administrative officers are "red herrings" that probably will do more to alienate the people you wish to influence than to enhance your status. Faculty status alone does not bring respect. Ideas and accomplishments do (Scott 1975).

In summary, let me quote from William Price (1978) and refer readers to his article: middle managers can become more effective if they "watch their time," "continue to learn," and "lead by example." Presidents can learn from middle-managers, too, if they follow this credo.

I have been enormously impressed by the middle-managers I have met, but they have achieved their status almost in spite of their institutions, or at least without conscious institutional support. They suffer and yet they prosper. They have a high degree of institutional loyalty, but must look off-campus, mostly to their associations, for training, guidance, recognition, colleagueship, and rewards. They are optimistic not because they believe things will get better, but that *they* will get better and rise to meet the new needs.

Implications

All roles evolve. Mid-level collegiate administrative positions are no exception. During the past century we have witnessed dramatic changes in the role of presidents and of faculty (Jencks and Riesman 1968). College and university organization has also evolved. And it is important to consider how these roles and organizations may evolve in the future.

Earlier we talked about the influences of external forces on in-

stitutions. These influences will no doubt continue unabated and new pressures will emerge. Certainly the declines projected in both financial support and enrollments will evoke new kinds of responses from evolving roles. Kenneth Boulding has commented in these terms:

> . . . decline management comes down to the problem of administration. Perhaps the crucial problem of the declining sector is that its administration becomes more difficult. . . . The skills of managing a declining institution are not different from but are probably in some sense greater than those required to manage institutional growth. There is in the former a greater need for empathy and for an all too rare mixture of compassion and realism and for the creative widening of agendas. The manager of a declining institution is required to think of more things that haven't been thought of. In a growing institution mistakes are easily corrected, in a declining institution they are not (Boulding 1975, p. 8).

Since new demands on institutions often result in the growth of middle-management, it is important to ask about the role of mid-level administrators in a period of retrenchment (Scott 1977b). Data suggest that administration will continue to grow even as teaching staff is cut back. But the role and status of administrative staff will remain the same.

That is why I value the metaphor of "lords, squires, and yeomen." The royalty annoints more lords when more are needed to handle the business of the kingdom, but they are still limited in mobility. The metaphor helps illuminate the unique organizational character of the university and the implications for middle-managers: mobility and opportunities for growth are limited by structural and philosophical impediments. In the profit sector, staff development is encouraged as a means of identifying future top managers. In higher education, staff development is seen as more important for the individual than for the organization. The metaphor also suggests the dilemma inherent in the issues of service versus control and the role conflicts and ambiguity that are built into middle-management positions. Selection, training, and condition can all be evaluated against this model.

Human relations theorists speak of maximizing one's potential in his role; they say that to speak of limits is to invoke a self-fulfilling prophesy of frustration. I agree that much more can be done to improve the lot of middle-managers, and I have tried to suggest some means of improvement. More imaginative plans must be tried. But I also submit that the die is cast—that there are severe limits to growth and change for college middle-managers as long as presidents and provosts are monarchs and the faculty is the royal family.

Bibliography

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education abstracts and indexes the current literature on higher education for the National Institution of Education's monthly bibliographic journal *Resources in Education (RIE)*. Most of these publications are available through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Ordering number and price for publications cited in this bibliography that are available from EDRS have been included at the end of each citation. Readers who wish to order a publication should write to the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Post Office Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210. When ordering, please specify the document number. Unless otherwise noted, documents are available in both microfiche (MF) and hard/photocopy (HC).

American Association of College Registrars and Admissions Officers, *A Survey of Salary Levels in the Admissions and Records Profession*. Washington, D.C.: AACRAO, 1977.

Altbach, Philip G. "Notes on the Study of the Academic Profession." *Higher Education* 7 (1977): 131-134.

Anderson, G. Lester. *The Evaluation of Academic Administrators: Principles, Processes, and Outcomes*. State Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 1975. ED 129 198. MF-$0.98; HC-$5.33.

Angus, W. S. "University Administrative Staff." *Public Administration* (The Journal of the Royal Institute of Public Administration) 51 (Spring 1973): 17-39.

Appendix to the Budget of the U.S. Government, Fiscal Year 1977. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977, pp. 440-441.

Argyris, Chris. "A Few Words in Advance." In *The Failure of Success*, edited by Alfred J. Marrow. New York: American Management Association, Inc., 1972, p. 7.

Bailey, Stephen K. *Education Interest Groups in the Nation's Capital*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1975.

Baldridge, J. Victor; Curtis, David V.; Ecker, George; and Riley, Gary L. *Policy Making and Effective Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1978.

Battaile, Janet. "Study Finds Few Gains in Women in College Jobs Since U.S. Outlawed Discrimination." *New York Times* (April 8, 1978): 24.

Baumgartel, Howard. "Evaluation of Management Development Efforts in the University Setting: Problems, Programmes, and Research Model." *New Frontiers in Education*—Delhi (1976): 23, 32, 33.

Bender, Louis W. *Federal Regulation and Higher Education.* ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: The American Association for Higher Education, 1977. ED 135 323. MF-$0.98; HC-$5.33.

Bender, Marylin. "Hilton International: Enforcing Standards." *New York Times* (July 23, 1976): D3.

Bennis, Warren, and Slater, Philip. *The Temporary Society.* New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Bess, James. "Incentives for Improving Administrative Competence and Performance." A Response to A Paper by Robert A. Scott Presented to the National Assembly of the American Association of University Administrators, Chicago, April 24, 1978.

Bess, James L., and Lodahl, Thomas M. "Career Patterns and Satisfactions in University Middle-Management." *Educational Record* 50 (Spring 1969): 220-229.

Bickel, Robert D., and Brechner, Judith A. *The College Administrator and the Court.* Asheville, North Carolina: College Administration Publications, Inc., 1978.

Blackwell, Thomas Edward. *College and University Administration.* New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.

Blankenship, Ralph L., ed. *Colleagues in Organization: The Social Construction of Professional Roles.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1977.

Blau, Peter M. *The Organization of Academic Work.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.

———. *On the Nature of Organization.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974.

Bogue, E. Grady. "Administrative Malpractice: The Limits of Common Sense." *Educational Record* 59 (Winter 1978): 77-86.

Bowen, Howard. "Institutional Costs in American Higher Education: Past Trends and Future Prospects." Draft of paper presented at City University of New York Graduate School Conference, March 30, 1978. Mimeographed.

Bowen, Howard R., and Minter, W. John. *Private Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1977. ED 119 570. MF-$0.98; HC-$6.85.

Braude, Lee. *Work and Workers: A Sociological Analysis.* New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975.

Brooks, Glenn E. "Administrative Modernization in British Universities." *Universities Quarterly* 27 (Autumn 1973): 431-456.

Brubacker, John S. *The Law and Higher Education.* Rutherford, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1971. Volume I—Students, Professors; Volume II—Administration, Academic Program, Torts.

Buchanan, Bruce, II. "Government Managers, Business Executives, and Organizational Commitment." *Public Administration Review* No. 4 (July/August 1974): 339-347.

Bucher, Rue and Stelling, Joan G. *Becoming Professional.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977.

Burns, Gerald P., editor. *Administrators in Higher Education: Their Functions and Coordination.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.

"Calendar of Meetings, Conventions, and Seminars in Academic 1977-78." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (October 3, 1977): 19n.

Campbell, Clifford C. "The Administration of Admissions." In *Marketing Higher Education.* Jossey-Bass Quarterly Report No. 21 (Spring 1978): 51-63.

Caplow, Theodore and McGee, Reece J. *The Academic Marketplace.* New York: Basic Books, 1958.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. *Making Affirmative Action Work in Higher Education: An Analysis of Institutional and Federal Policies, With Recommendations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975, pp. 32-33.

Carroll, Archie B. "The Role Conflict Phenomenon: Implications for Department Chairmen and Academic Faculty." *Improving College and University Teaching* (August 1976): 245-6.

CASE (Council for Advancement and Support of Education) Certificate Program brochure. Washington, D.C.: CASE, n.d.

Chambers, Peter. "The Squeeze of Middle Managers: The Loss of Executive Authority." *Management Review* (September 1975): 50-52.

Cherry, Charles. "The Essential Education of an Augustinian Administrator." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (April 10, 1978): 48.

Chronicle of Higher Education, "Fact file" (July 11, 1977): 8-10.

———. "Fact file" (May 15, 1978): 8.

———. (May 22, 1978): 8. Advertisement for AAUA (American Association of University Administrators).

Clark, Burton. "The Sociology of Educational Administration," in

Perspectives on Educational Administration and Behavioral Sciences. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965, pp. 51 ff.

Cleveland, Harlan. *Seven Everyday Collisions in American Higher Education.* New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1974.

———. "The Education of Administrators for Higher Education." Fourth David D. Henry Lecture, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois, April 13-14, 1977. HE 010 102. MF-$0.98; HC-$2.54.

Cofer, C. N., and Appley, M. H. *Motivation: Theory and Research.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

Cohen, M. D., and March, J. G. *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Constance, Clifford. *Historical Review of the Association.* Compiled under the direction of the Executive Committee. Washington, D.C.: AACRAO, 1973.

Cornell Chronicle. "Grievance Procedures Improving." (March 9, 1978): 3.

Cox, Archibald. *The Role of the Supreme Court in American Government.* New York. Oxford University Press, 1976.

Davis, Jerry S., and Van Dusen, William D. *Guide to the Literature of Student Financial Aid.* New York: The College Board, 1978.

Digest of Educational Statistics. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics. 1973, 1974, 1976 editions. 1973: ED 088 240. MF-$0.98; HC-$10.97. 1974: ED 104 018. MF-$0.98; HC-$10.87. 1976: ED 144 248. MF-$0.98; HC-$13.73.

Dressel, Paul L. *Handbook of Academic Evaluation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.

Drinkwater, David. "Student Rights and Legal Norms." Amherst College, 1978. Mimeographed.

Drucker, Peter. *Management.* New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Eble, Kenneth E. *The Art of Administration.* San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Farmer, Charles H. "Current Practices in Administrator Evaluation." Remarks prepared for the conference "Running Higher Education" on the evaluation and development of administrators in higher education, cosponsored by the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges and the American Association for Higher Education, February 2, 1977. Mimeographed.

Fisher, Charles F. "The Evaluation and Development of College and

University Administrators." *ERIC/Higher Education Research Currents.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, March 1977a. ED 136 711. MF-$0.98; HC-$2.15. June 1977c. ED 139 363. MF-$0.98; HC-$2.15.

———. "Proposal of a Working Idea . . . A National Academy for Leadership Development in Postsecondary Education." Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, April 1977b. Mimeographed.

Fowler, Elizabeth. "In-House Education by Companies." *New York Times* (June 10, 1977).

———. "The Obsolescence of Professionals." *New York Times* (June 24, 1977): D5.

———. "Environment and Opportunity." *New York Times* (April 5, 1978): 57.

Gaff, Sally Shake; Festa, Conrad; and Gaff, Jerry G. *Professional Development: A Guide to Resources.* New York: Change Magazine Press, 1978.

Galloway, Sylvia W. and Fisher, Charles F. *A Guide to Professional Development Opportunities for College and University Administrators 1978.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1978.

Genova, William J.; Madoff, Marjorie K.; and Thomas, George B. *Mutual Benefit Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators in Higher Education.* Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1976.

Gifford, Prosser. "Scholars' 'Servants.' " *New York Times* (January 26, 1978): 29.

Glenny, Lyman A. "The Anonymous Leaders of Higher Education." *The Journal of Higher Education,* Volume 43 (January 1972): 9-22.

Glueck, Grace. "Met Museum Vote Set on Dual Chiefs." *New York Times* (October 6, 1977): 58.

Gordon, C. "Role and Value Development Across the Life-Cycle." *In Role,* Sociological Studies 4, edited by J. A. Jackson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972, pp. 65-106.

Graves, Thomas, president of the College of William and Mary; interview, October 10, 1977.

Greenaway, H. K. "The Role of the Registrar in Academic Government—Some Contrasts Between Canada and Britain." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 7 (1977): 67-71.

Greenberg, Irving. Remarks made at the National Assembly of the American Association of University Administrators, April 24, 1978.

Griffin, Gerald, and Burks, David R. *Appraising Administrative*

Operations: A Guide for Universities and Colleges. Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1976. ED 142 122. MF-$0.98; HC-$10.87.

Gross, Richard F. "Growth Contracts for Administrators." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 7-10, 1976. Mimeographed.

Grumbach, Doris. "Searching for the Genuine Seekers." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (March 20, 1978): 29.

Halsey, A. H., and Trow, Martin. *The British Academics.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Harris, Seymour. *A Statistical Portrait of Higher Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Hauser, Jane, and Lazarsfeld, Paul. *The Admissions Officer in the American College: An Occupation Under Change.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1964.

Henderson, Algo, and Henderson, Jean G. *Higher Education in America: Problems, Priorities, Prospects.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.

Hendrickson, Robert M., and Mangum, Ronald Scott. *Governing Board and Administrator Liability.* ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 9. Washington, D.C.: the American Association for Higher Education, 1977. ED 148 256. MF-$0.98; HC-$5.33.

Hollander, Patricia A. "Legal Implications of the Professional Development of Administrators: A Look at Due Process." Paper presented at the National Assembly of the American Association of University Administrators, Chicago, 1976. Mimeographed.

Humphries, Jack W. "Student Personnel Professionals: Is There a Future?" *Educational Record* 58 (Winter 1977): 59-65.

Ikenberry, Stanley O. "The Organizational Dilemma." *Journal of Higher Education* 43 (January 1972): 23-34.

Ingraham, Mark, with King, Francis P. *The Mirror of Brass: The Compensation and Working Conditions of College and University Administrators.* Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.

"In-Service Staff Development." *College and University Bulletin* (October 1976): 3, 4, 8.

Jencks, Christopher, and Riesman, David. *The Academic Revolution.* New York: Doubleday and Company, 1968.

Johnson, Annette R., and Ripps, Stephen R. "Tort Liability of College and University Faculty, Administrators, and Trustees." In *Higher Education and the Law: An Administrator's Overview,*

edited by Vance T. Peterson. Toledo, Ohio: Center for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Toledo, 1977. ED 142 114. MF-$0.98; HC-$8.01.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Kaplin, William A. *The Law of Higher Education: Legal Implications of Administrative Decision Making*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

———. "The Changing Shape of Work, and its Bearing on Family and Education: Psychosocial Trends in America." Address presented at the Closing Plenary Session of the 1978 National Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, March 22, 1978a, p. 7. Mimeographed.

———. "Powerlessness." *New York Times* (April 6, 1978b): 31.

Katz, Daniel, and Kahn, Robert L. *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Kay, Immanuel. "New Alternatives for Middle Managers." *Management Review* (October 1973): 4-10. See also. *The Crisis in Middle Management*. New York: AMACOM, 1974.

King, Lauriston R. *The Washington Lobbyists for Higher Education*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1975.

Knapp, David C. "Management: Intruder in the Academic Dust." *Educational Record* 50 (Winter 1969): 55-59.

Knapp, Paul. Interview, June 16, 1977.

Knowles, Asa S., editor-in-chief. *Handbook of College and University Administration*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970. Volume I—General; Volume II—Academic.

Kramer, Hilton. "When the Man in Charge Is Not the Man Who Knows." *New York Times* (July 3, 1977): D1, 17.

Leavitt, Harold J. *Managerial Psychology*. Fourth Edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Leslie, David W. "Emerging Standards for 'Good Faith' in Administrative Behavior." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Chicago, Illinois, March 19, 1978. Mimeographed.

Lichtenstein, Grace. "Men Hold Most Top College Jobs 5 Years After U.S. Order on Bias." *New York Times* (December 6, 1977): 18.

Likert, Rensis. *New Patterns of Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Lodahl, Thomas W., and Kejner, Mathilde. "The Definition and

Measurement of Job Involvement." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 49 (1965): 24-33.

Lusterman, Seymour. *Education in Industry*. New York: The Conference Board, 1977.

Maccoby, Michael. *The Gamesman: The New Corporate Leaders*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.

———. "Trust Is Also the Business of Business." *New York Times* (March 31, 1978): A27.

Martin, Dallas. Interview, June 15, 1977.

McClelland, David. *The Achieving Society*. New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1961.

McHenry, D. E., and Associates. *Academic Departments: Problems, Variations, and Alternatives*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

McInnes, William C. "A Statement of Rights for College Administrators." *Journal of Higher Education* 42 (May 1971): 374-386.

McVey, Frank L., and Hughes, Raymond M. *Problems of College and University Administration*. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State College Press, 1952.

Mertin, Paul F. *Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education: Current Funds, Revenues and Expenditures*. Washington, D.C.: USOE, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969 and 1974 editions. 1969: ED 093 212. MF-$0.98; HC-$6.67. 1974: ED 129 188. MF-$0.98; HC-$2.54.

Meyer, Marshall W. *Bureaucratic Structure and Authority*. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Millett, John D. Interview, June 17, 1977.

Moodie, Graeme C. and Eustace, Rowland. *Power and Authority in British Universities*. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1974, pp. 154-169.

Murray, Michael A. "Defining the Higher Education Lobby." *Journal of Higher Education* 47 (January/February 1976): 79-92.

NACUBO (National Association of College and University Business Officers). *The College and University Interassociation Related Group Profile*. Washington, D.C.: NACUBO, November 1976.

NACUBO Focus 1977-78. Washington, D.C.: NACUBO, 1978.

NACUBO/Exxon Administrative Leave Program. Brochure. Washington, D.C.: NACUBO, n.d.

National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators. *Characteristics and Attitudes of the Financial Aid Administrator*. A Re-

port of the Survey of the Profession in 1977. Washington, D.C.: NASFA, 1978.

National Center for Public Service Internships. *Directory*. Washington, D.C., 1976.

New York Times on job bias (June 10, 1977): F12.

———. "Job Tests: Confusion of Government Rules." (September 23, 1977): D5.

———. "Challenges for Corporate Appraisals." (October 21, 1977): D5.

———. "Study Finds Merit System of U.S. 'Is Not Working.'" (October 23, 1977): 4.

———. "It's a Different Yale, as A New Blue Takes Over." (December 25, 1977): E7.

———. "Middle-Managers: Hard Hit by Inflation." (February 10, 1978): D9.

Nielsen, Oswald, ed. *University Administration in Practice*. Stanford, California: Stanford University School of Business, 1959.

Packwood, William T., ed. *College Student Personnel Services*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1977.

Parsons, Talcott, and Platt, Gerald M. *The American University*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Perkins, James A., ed. *The University As An Organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1973.

Perrott, Roy. *The Aristocrats, A Portrait of Britain's Nobility and Their Way of Life Today*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1968.

Persson, Leonard N. "Impact of Collective Bargaining and Programs of Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action on the Role of the Personnel Officer." *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* (July-August, 1976): 21-76.

Peterson, Vance T., ed. *Higher Education and the Law: An Administrator's Overview*. Ohio: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1977. ED 142 114. MF-$0.98; $8.01.

Popitz, H. "The Concept of Social Role as an Element of Sociological Theory." In *Role*, Sociological Studies 4, edited by J. A. Jackson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972, pp. 11-40.

President's Executive Internship Program. Brochure, 1977.

Price, William C. "Effective Middle Management in Higher Education." *College and University* (Fall 1977): 33-41.

Raley, Nancy. "Alumni Association Profile." *CASE Currents* (January 1978): 30-31. See also "Membership Survey re *Currents* and CASE Services, January 3, 1977." Washington, D.C.: CASE, 1977.

Richardson, Elliot. *The Creative Balance: Government, Politics, and the Individual in America's Third Century*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Richardson, Richard C., Jr. "Staff Development: A Conceptual Framework." *Journal of Higher Education* 46 (May/June 1975): 303-312.

Richman, Barry M. and Farmer, Richard N. *Leadership, Goals, and Power in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 1974.

Roberts, Steven V. "Federal Magnetism Draws Law Firms." *New York Times* (January 11, 1978): 29, 37.

———. "Trade Associations Flocking to Capital as U.S. Role Rises." *New York Times* (March 4, 1978): 23, 44.

Rourke, Francis E. and Brooks, Glenn E. "The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 9 (September 1964): 154-181. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1966.

Rudolph, Frederick. *The American College and University: A History*. New York: Vantage Books, 1962.

Russel, John E. and Galin, Jesse I. "The Admissions Officer: New Challenges and Responsibilities." *College and University* (Spring 1978): 291-296.

Ryan, Doris. "Deans as Individuals-In-Organizations." The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, August 1977. Mimeographed.

Ryan, James H. "Continuing Education for College and University Administrators, or Improving Management Capacity for the Prisoner of Higher Education." Paper presented at the National Assembly of the American Association of University Administrators, Chicago, 1976. Mimeographed.

Scott, Robert A. "Middle-Management on Campus: Training Ground or Wasteland." *National ACAC Journal* 20 (1975): 38-40.

———. "Do Admissions Counselors Read?" *NACAC Journal* 20 (January 1976a): 22-27.

———. "The Terms and Tasks of 'Open Admissions.'" *College and University* 51 (Spring 1976b): 287-290.

———. "Advising on Campus: A Problem of Perception." *Cornell Chronicle* (April 8, 1976c): 4.

———. "Misdirected Missionaries: Personnel Officers in Academe." Speech presented at the Annual Meeting of the College and University Personnel Association, October 17, 1977a, Cincinnati, Ohio. Mimeographed.

———. "Middle-Level Collegiate Administration in a Period of Re-

trenchment." *College and University* 53 (Fall 1977b): 42-56. ED 134 068. MF-$0.98; HC-$2.15.

———. "More Than Greenbacks and Red Tape: The Hidden Costs of Government Regulation." *Change Magazine* 10 (April 1978a): 16-23. An expanded version of this paper will appear in a fall 1978 Change Magazine Press book on the effects of government on higher education.

———. "Yeast for the Yeoman, Sauce for the Squires: Incentives for Improving Administrative Competence and Performance." Paper presented to the National Assembly of the American Association of University Administrators, Chicago, April 24, 1978b. Mimeographed.

———. "The Paradox of Financial Aid: Washington Reverence, Campus Neglect." *College Board Review* (Summer 1978c).

———. "Beleaguered Yeomen: Comments on the Condition of Collegiate Middle Managers." *College and University* (Winter 1979): in press.

———. *Report to the Exxon Education Foundation.* A study of the effects of federal regulations on college and university costs, operations, and administrative organization, 1978e.

Shattock, Michael. "A Changing Pattern of University Administration." *Universities Quarterly* 24 (Summer 1970): 310-320.

Sheppard, Harold L. and Neal Q. Herrick. *Where Have All the Robots Gone? Worker Dissatisfaction in the 70's.* New York: Free Press, 1972.

Shoemaker, William A. "The Chicken or the Egg: The Interdependence of Information Systems and Personnel Development." Paper presented at the conference "Running Higher Education," co-sponsored by the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges and the American Association for Higher Education, Airlie House, Warrenton, Virginia, February 1-4, 1977. Mimeographed. ED 134 072. MF-$0.98; HC-$2.15.

Sofer, Cyril. *Men in Mid-Career: A Study of British Managers and Technical Specialists.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Solmon, Lewis C., and Michael Tierney. "Determinants of Job Satisfaction Among College Administrators." *Journal of Higher Education* 48 (July/August 1977): 412-431.

Stewart, Kenneth L. "What a University Ombudsman Does: A Sociological Study of Everyday Conduct." *Journal of Higher Education* 49 (1978): 1-22.

Thomas, Gerald S. *Organizational Commitment: Sources and Impli-*

cations for the Development of Middle Managers. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1978.

Thompson, Ronald B. *Projections of Enrollments, Public and Private Colleges and Universities, 1970-1987.* Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, December 1970, p. 5.

Tice, Terrence N. *Student Rights, Decision Making, and the Law.* ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 10. Washington, D.C.: The American Association for Higher Education, 1976. ED 135 269. MF-$0.98; HC-$6.67.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America.* A New Translation by George Laurence, edited by J. P. Mayer. New York: Harper and Row, 1966. Anchor Edition, 1969.

"Training and Development Opportunities at Cornell." Training and Development Section, University Personnel Services. Ithaca: Cornell University, n.d. Brochure.

Van Alstyne, Carol; Mensel, R. Frank; Withers, Julie S.; and Malott, F. Stephen. *Special Supplement: 1975-76 Administrative Compensation Survey, Women and Minorities in Administration of Higher Education Institutions, Employment Patterns and Salary Comparisons.* Washington, D.C.: College and University Personnel Association, June 1977a.

———; Withers, Julie; and Elliott, Sharon. "Affirmative Inaction: The Bottom Line Tells the Tale." *Change Magazine* 9 (August 1977b): 39-41, 60.

Van de Graaf, John. "Evolution in Higher and Professional Education: Questions of Authority." In *Reorganizing Education: Management and Participation for Change,* edited by Edmund King. Sage Annual Review of Social and Educational Change. Volume 1, 1977. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977.

Veblen, Thorsten. *The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men.* New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1918.

Vinson, David D. *The Admissions Officer—A Decade of Change.* Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, 1977.

von Moltke, Konrad, and Schneevoigt, Norbert. *Educational Leaves for Employees: European Experience for American Consideration.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1977.

Westin, Alan F. "A New Move Toward Employee Rights." *New York Times* (Sunday, April 23, 1978): 18F.

Whitmire, Duane. "The Admissions Officer: A Study of Change in the

Profile, Status, and Professionalism of a Higher Education Administrator." *The National ACAC Journal* 22 (January 1978): 10.

Willingham, Warren W. *Professional Development of Financial Aid Officers*. Higher Education Surveys Report No. 2. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970. ED 051 757. MF-$0.98; HC-$2.54.

Winstead, Philip C. "Management by Objectives." Presentation made at the conference on "Running Higher Education" cosponsored by the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges and the American Association for Higher Education, Airlie House, Warrenton, Virginia, February 1-4, 1972. Mimeographed.

Wolanin, Thomas H. "The Higher Education Associations: Political Resources and Style." *Phi Delta Kappan* 58 (October 1976): 181-184.

Work in America. Report of a special task force of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1973.

Zion, Carol. "Role Definition: A Focus for Administrative Growth and Evaluation." *The Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 28 (Summer 1977): 5-12.

Zonana, Victor F. "For Young, Ambitious Executives, The Ladder Upward is Vanishing." *Ithaca Journal* (August 26, 1975). Reprinted from *The Wall Street Journal*.